

THE

# CONGREGATIONAL REVIEW.

---

VOL. X.—NOVEMBER, 1870.—No. 56.

---

## ARTICLE I.

### EDUCATION IN ITS RELATIONS TO THE REPUBLIC.\*

I propose to speak of education in its relations to the republic. In its widest scope education extends to every interest of society, and the events of our own time are directing the thoughts of public men, as never before, to its paramount importance.

In discussing a theme so comprehensive and difficult, and which I have elaborated only so far as constant and exacting public duties would allow, I deem myself fortunate that I speak to a brotherhood of scholars, at once appreciative and indulgent.

The field to which I invite you has long been cultivated, and perhaps exhausted by other laborers, but I apprehend it has a rich and fertile subsoil which, brought to the light, will repay our toil.

That a free state can be organized and maintained only by an educated people; that the necessity for laws and coercion

\*An Address delivered at the Annual Commencement of Iowa College,  
July, 1870.

is in inverse ratio to the intellectual and moral training of their subjects; that a nation's material prosperity and progress in civilization keep pace with its schools, as theories, are old as Plato, but with us have been made the groundwork of civil institutions. These truths, we, as a people, assume as principles of our social and political systems. Here, then, more than elsewhere, the education of the people is the first duty of the state. If the liberty and prosperity of the country draw their vitality from this source, if they would fall into impotency and perish without it, by what logic can this responsibility of the state be shirked or transferred?

A properly instructed community, being a law unto itself, can well dispense with much of the customary legislation and expensive machinery of government, but never with the primal conditions of a social and civil compact. The family, though the type of the state, can not, in this work of education, be its substitute. In its economy, the right of the parent to control and direct, springs from the capacity of the child, and involves an obligation to teach and discipline. This reciprocal relation is a natural one, and cannot be dispensed with. We reject the theory of Spartan statesmen, that the family should hand over its functions to the state, as subversive of the very fundamental idea of the social organization. On the other hand, experience teaches that the family cannot be relied upon to discharge its own, much less the primal duties of the state.

With whom, then, shall the work of popular education rest? A consolidated government can readily assume the responsibility, but in a confederate republic it is doubtful where the power may best be located. Our constitution leaves it primarily with the states, and they remit it to their municipalities. Can we safely surrender, *in perpetuo*, to local communities, the sole execution of a trust in which reposes, not simply the welfare, but the destinies of the nation?

In its origin our federal system did not contemplate any interference of the national government with purely domestic affairs. The convention of 1787 found schools established in

a part of the states, and believing that each would feel all the motives which could impress the whole with the importance of popular education, and would provide by municipal legislation for its maintenance, left to them unrestricted power over the whole subject. Several of the ablest of the framers and some of the learned expounders of the constitution have claimed that though this right has always been exercised by the states, it could be resumed, if necessary, by the national government, as inhering in the guaranties of the constitution, or as an essential means to its own preservation. The more general understanding, however, is, that it is a power reserved to the states.

But, however this may be, looking purely to the ends of government, to supply the means of learning and to promote the intellectual discipline of the children of a nation would fall as legitimately within the scope of national legislation as commerce, currency or naturalization. Should the welfare of the republic demand the establishment of a national system of education, as I anticipate it may, there is nothing in the nature of our institutions, or in the work itself, to forbid such a change in the fundamental law as will confer upon the general government the power, if it does not now possess it, to establish such a system. If science ministers to the common comfort and prosperity, if it lightens the labors and increases the powers of production, if it covers the land with cultivated farms, with railroads and factories, and the sea with ships—if the study of art refines the popular taste and awakens a genius for poetry and painting, statuary and architecture—if the pleasures of a cultivated mind pluck from passion and appetite their power to control and debase national character—if the discipline of intellect gives skill in diplomacy, power in the senate, the forum, the cabinet and the field, if it imparts definite and comprehensive views of business and trade at home and abroad,—then the schools in which these are to be secured may be brought as normally under national jurisdiction as any subject now within the scope of federal power.

At the organization of the government the necessity for

such a provision was not felt. The original inhabitants of the States which formed the Union, though not learned in a wide range of studies, were thoroughly acquainted with a few essential elements of knowledge. They were a thoughtful, self-poised, homogeneous people, and passionately fond of the country whose whole history was the brief record of their own and their father's lives. Its story had not been entered upon the roll of history or celebrated in song, but was precious in the memory of its children. A hundred and fifty years of terrible but glorious struggles had purged from their souls the lust of gain, and given to their patriotism something of the lofty fervor which inspired the armies of the Commonwealth. Unseduced by luxury or the splendors of wealth, their aspirations were pure, their wants but few. Liberty was not to them a sentiment, a Utopian dream, imparting a blind frenzy to the mind and impelling to Quixotic adventures, but a sober, substantial reality, to be embodied in law and perpetuated by a manly and prudent policy.

Laying the foundations of government for such a people, the fathers built wisely. They did not anticipate that the manorial system of plantations would exclude common schools from the southern half of the Union. They could not foresee the incoming of ignorant populations, revolutionary and unaccustomed to self-government, pouring annually by the half million through the gates of the sea. The annexation of half civilized peoples upon our borders, untouched by the desire of knowledge, and the uplifting of four millions of undisciplined slaves to all the privileges and responsibilities of citizenship, did not enter into their calculation of the problem of self-government. Could their eyes have pierced the shadows which lay upon the first century of the nation's life, they might have foreseen a national system of schools to be as necessary for the internal peace and integrity of the country, as the instrumentalities of war for its external defence.

The tendency of our time is to an unrestricted participation in all political rights; whether the movement is healthy or unhealthy, must be determined in each case by the state of soci-

ety. Civil liberty I assume to be the best condition of progress, and hence the right of all; but political, like professional privileges, belong only to those who can use them for the public good. Outside of the family, no man has a natural right to rule another. Our responsibilities are individual, and hence our rights must be individual also. It follows, that, in the organization and administration of civil institutions for the common good, each man is entitled to a voice, unless his want of capacity unfits him properly or safely to exercise political functions. When this is his condition he cannot claim the right, for it is overruled by the higher law of public safety and the general welfare. The criminal, the insane, the idiot, the minor, and equally they whose understandings have not been sufficiently developed to comprehend the nature and importance of political duties, have no inborn, and hence inalienable right of suffrage. The natural tendency of its exercise by such is to derange, and, if sufficiently extended, to subvert government. If voting is an inalienable right, then a political bedlam is the divinely appointed condition of two-thirds of the globe. A prudent statesmanship may, as a choice of evils, bestow the ballot upon the unfit and the unworthy, if a small minority of the whole population, but never as a natural right.

Let a majority of the people of this country lapse into an ignorance as profound, I will not say as that of their old Saxon and British ancestors, but as that of the English of the Elizabethan reign, and self-rule would be impossible. What then? After a little, the people exhausted and disgusted by misrule would allow one or more of the intelligent minority to usurp the reins of government and hold them for a time in the interests of public order. And what next? In a twelvemonth the violent, factious, unvoting majority would revolutionize for the recovery to the people of powers which they could not safely exercise. So through all time the shuttle of power flying between people and despot has woven the checkered and bloody web of human history.

Society is now pregnant with the spirit of revolution, and there seems to be no alternative to blood but the ballot. To

educate, therefore, is the most imperative duty of patriotism. Not only the thrift and enterprise of our people, but their liberties hang upon the wide spread intelligence of the masses, continued from generation to generation.

What is our condition? In 1860, one-sixth of our entire population was foreign; one-sixth of our voting population was foreign; one-tenth of our whole population could neither read nor write; one-tenth of our voting population could neither read nor write. Since then, four millions of slaves, a hundred thousand Chinamen, and more than two millions of other foreigners have been added to the body of our people. In the same period, eight hundred thousand foreign, and seven hundred thousand colored citizens have swollen our voting lists. This million and a half, added in eight years, have cast down the average intelligence of our countrymen till more than a sixth cannot read the vote they carry to the polls. Yet the tides of emigration pouring eastward through the golden, and westward through the rocky gates of the sea, are rising and breaking upon our shores beyond all precedent. A restless desire for the annexation of large communities upon our borders is spreading, and unrestricted naturalization, as well as unlimited suffrage, is the imperative demand of the hour.

Where all this will end, God only knows. But it is clear to our apprehension, that the states which are in the worst condition are impotent. At the South, on account of social relations, the division of property, especially landed estates, and the general poverty, schools for the whole population cannot be established for years, except by national aid.

The institutions, not less than the arts of a people, must be born of their own history and adapted to their mental condition and national habits. When political progress, by the force of public excitement, outruns the absolute advance of ideas and discipline, all things assume a state of unstable equipoise, and a failure of crops, a depressed market, a crisis in business, or an excited election, is liable to upheave and overturn institutions which are indispensable, and hallowed by the memories of men.

in whose blood their foundations were laid. The stability and well-being of society demand that governments should be liberalized *pari passu* with a popular capacity of self-restraint, and that is largely a result of knowledge and experience.

Had we the wizard power to destroy by a word all the precious and imposing fruits of centuries of growth, and to force upon a refined and cultivated community the pursuits, customs and simple rule of barbarism, they would be sloughed in a night, and government, social institutions, arts, industrious and refined pleasures would spring again from the brain of civilization, as Minerva from the head of Jove; and if in turn we were to impose upon a nation of savages the institutions of an enlightened people, they would be an incumbrance and an oppression, lapsing swiftly to the low level of the national mind. It would be like the attempt to fit the armor of an Achilles to the limbs of a Lilliputian; to force the ideas of men into the conception of children. Such things can not be. They are unnatural and absurd.

Popular self-government is the government of the aggregate reason and moral sense of a nation. To impose its forms upon the wild, undisciplined passions of men untaught to reflect or recognize the obligations of justice, is as idle as was the effort of the Persian monarch to restrain the madness of the sea in fetters of gold.

Liberty, too, in its larger sense, like institutions, is a growth, and can only be maintained by perpetuating the intellectual condition out of which it springs.

There are other forces of civilization besides the schools, such as the telegraph and the press, greatly relied upon by many as instruments of popular education. That these are marvelous triumphs of modern science, and must have a transcendent influence upon mankind, can not be questioned. The viewless and imponderable courier of the air escaping all resistance and the delays of gravitation, and clinging to its wiry path, shoots the oceans and vaults the continents in its search for news, and without lapse of time communicates to the daily press its intelligence of the antipodes. Ministering

to the interests of commerce, it interchanges hourly between the great marts of the world, the prices of the market, the fluctuations of stocks, the results of production, the arrival and departure of vessels, the rates of exchange, and all the special intelligence of business. Its metallic voice is clinking continually into the ear of the public the movements of armies, the action of senates, and the secrets of cabinets.

The press is the complement of the telegraph. Its messengers are as omnipresent and sleepless as the electric fire stolen by our own Prometheus from the chariot of Jove, and which a maiden's hand dispatches from continent to continent, the servitor of her pleasure. It publishes the latest discoveries of the laboratory in anticipation of their report to the academy of the *savans*. It spirits away for our morning repast the immortal thoughts which the man of letters has coined painfully from his laboring brain in the seclusion of his studio. It gives fiery wings to the words of gold which drop from the lips of oratory, and dispatches them to the most distant hamlet while yet the voice of the speaker is ringing in our ears.

The influence of all this cannot be fully foreshadowed. Such a rapid and universal interchange of facts and ideas must go far to break down national prejudices and differences and give a unity of institutions and civilization. Peoples the most distant in space and character are brought face to face, and will gradually be transformed into the same image. No longer will a few great centres of wealth and culture be able to monopolize the trade and travel of the world. Hereafter New York and Boston will make their daily orders and drafts upon Liverpool and Hong Kong. Trade will become cosmopolitan, and a genius for business find scope and success in any quarter of the globe.

Turn now for a moment to the reverse of this picture, and consider whether these facilities improve or deteriorate the national intellect and conscience. If modern science and invention daily cast the ideas of our Christian civilization into the stagnant pool of Asiatic life and unsettle the iron monopolies of aristocratic Europe, will they not bring back and mingle

somewhat with our sentiments the effete dogmas and loose morality of older countries and earlier times? How far these shall affect and modify our own national character must be determined by the force and thoroughness with which the ideas peculiarly our own are inculcated and impressed upon the American mind.

But the telegraph and daily press not only disseminate foreign ideas, but exert a direct and peculiar influence upon the popular mind. The former gives to the public the skeleton of affairs; the latter epitomizes all things. In this way an appetite for news has been created, and has grown by what it fed upon, until it has become a national characteristic. Like the Athenians of old, we constantly demand some new thing. The holders of cable and journal stocks coin wealth out of the passion which they have thus engendered, and are constantly impelled by cupidity to pander to its gratification. This requires, in a time and country like ours, a large and constantly increasing corps of correspondents, for with time and space overcome, men demand information of all events of life which can interest society throughout the world. To decrease the expense required to meet this demand, correspondents must be secured at moderate rates, and consequently are, as a rule, young men of partial attainments and immaturity of judgment, incapable of comprehending and intelligently discussing the great social, industrial and political questions which agitate society. They cannot unfold and properly present what they do not understand. Annoyed by a want of means, they are constantly tempted to supply their necessities by writing for a paltry perquisite whatever personal vanity, ambition or malice may require to mislead and prejudice the public mind. When this does not happen, the constant call of the paper for something saleable almost compels the correspondent, whose pay is regulated by the sensational character of his letters, either to create news when it does not exist, or so to abbreviate or extenuate what does exist as entirely to misrepresent facts. Thus it happens that the public mind is misinformed and abused upon much of general importance which transpires.

Observation can not fail to impress thoughtful men with the conviction that, while the press exerts an influence to awaken and educate the popular mind, it is a power often prostituted by men reckless of their great responsibilities, and who by purposely or carelessly misrepresenting public men and public measures, transform a noble instrument of social advancement into a subservient and mercenary tool of personal and selfish interests.

Another, and, if possible, worse effect of all this is, the destruction which it works to the conditions of correct reasoning. In a great country like this, the information which constitutes the basis of popular judgment and action on national affairs must be derived from the public journals. If these are unreliable, there is no assurance, no possibility even, of correct views or of wise and prudent action by the masses. Without knowledge, the nation drifts at the mercy of prejudice and passion in the selection of men and measures, and great interests are liable to be sacrificed and public safety endangered. No man accustomed to trace the sources of national character, or of the revolutions of society, either in history or active life, can fail to feel solicitude when affairs and polities are wilfully misrepresented by the organs of public opinion; when the largest ability, the loftiest patriotism and the purest life are no protection against the malignant attacks of literary scavengers, whose vocation is to exalt mediocrity and to lift vice into the seats of virtue; when the suffrages of the people in whose wisdom reposes the safety of the republic, are sought by appeals to class interests and party ambition, rather than by an able and fair discussion of measures and policies.

But a more serious question still is, the effect of this general and rapid diffusion of imperfect intelligence upon national character. It furnishes, as we have seen, defective premises for the logic of affairs. Does it not also dwarf and leave unreliable the reasoning faculty itself? The tendency of this is to destroy the habit of thorough investigation and patient thought. A disrelish for profound and philosophical treatises

upon any subject, even the most fundamental and essential, is created in the public mind. Men learn to do business on telegraphic dispatches, rather than on principles of economy. When we can read the market rates at morning, mid-day and night, we do not study the principles of trade. We come to depend on action, not philosophy, for success. With the power of production increased fifty-fold by the mechanical application of new forces, the desire for gain has increased a hundred-fold. We do not find the leisure we did in the good old dispensation of manual labor. There is more to do, and as invention will not multiply our days, we must live faster. Thought and study must be done by machinery at the expense of mental force and discipline. Our system may secure more learning, but less brain power than the ancient. Scholars and thinkers are generally poor, and as it does not pay to be profound and thorough, they must be facile and brilliant. The flippant politician fills the public eye, and the philosophic statesman is commisserated as a fogey. We worship the practical and despise the theoretical. The works of Bacon lie upon our shelves musty and moth-eaten, but the last Patent Office Report is more soiled and thumb-worn than a missive of the church. Homer and Plato we allow were well enough for the metaphysical and song-smitten Greeks, but then they could not build a steamship or run a factory, and would be lightly esteemed in this practical age. We like men who can do things. Professors are a sort of necessary evil to be endured at fifteen hundred a year, but they are of no reputation in Wall street as compared with a first-class book-keeper. In a word, the present system runs all to surface, and ignores the fact that when the connection between the limb and the root which seeks the soil is cut, the fruitage dies.

We may continue to produce financial reports and tables of statistics which would have overwhelmed the ancients, but no great original epic or system of philosophy will spring from our technics. History, even, is likely to become more difficult of production and less trustworthy on account of the unreliable and contradictory character of its sources, though mul-

tiplied infinitely. Would it be a light task to sift the materials and prepare a truthful history of the late war? The movements of the army were daily heralded to the whole country, but the correspondent and operator, as a rule, wrote or telegraphed for the sale of his newspaper or the popularity of his patron. Skirmishes were magnified into battles, defeats made victories, and a bedecked poltroon lifted into a hero, while great events and heroic deeds, if done by an Achilles either too poor or too honorable to pay his Homer, were left "unhonored and unsung." The aggregate influence of all this upon the nation cannot be doubtful. It tends to smartness, rather than depth; to nimbleness, rather than strength.

We need not travel for intercourse, for the world will come to us; and, as often happens, we are liable to become cosmopolitan at the sacrifice of simple-heartedness and home virtues. We may acquire the expertness of a city attorney, and lose the power drawn from meditation and a quiet communion with books and nature. Continual excitement will hardly fail to work a permanent heat in the veins of childhood which will illly comport with the staid and massive character of the fathers. Wisdom may be sacrificed to sprightliness, and our future be as distinguished for revolutions as the past for steady progress.

But, my brethren, I hope better things of you, though I thus speak. "Through faith we understand the worlds were framed," and through faith we must lay here the secure foundations of a great empire of free States, the home of a race of men more pure, self-controlled and able, than any who have gone before. Schools must be established which shall do for the whole country what they have done for New England. The tendency to superficiality must be forestalled by giving to those who will succeed us a discipline so thorough, mental furniture so complete, and habits of investigation so firmly fixed, as to counteract the backward drift of society.

In Europe, where every advantage of nature has been appropriated, where the gradations of society are fixed and secure against any force but revolution, and where the individual can

rise only by superior capacity or attainments, personal ambition impels to laborious study; but here, where wealth and place wait upon uncultured enterprise, youth impatiently brooks the delay of the schools. The resistless and untempered energy which has characterized and ruined most civic democracies, which impelled the Florentine, as Machiavelli says, to embrace every new form of government, simply because it was new; which gave a nervous energy to the *demos* of the Pnyx eagerly pursuing through public places the *τι κατηύσι*, when with manly heroism they should have been hurling back the Macedonian phalanx, as their brawny ancestors did the Persians; that restless activity which, inconstant, irritable and impatient of delay, adopts the motto of Plutocracy, "*Si possis, recte; si non, quocunque modo rem,*" which gives itself over to the acquisition of wealth and the enjoyment of a luxurious life, till it sinks its victims, bereft of virility and all sense of honor, and, tormented with an aimless unrest into the decrepitude of national power, will here play again its tragic rôle, and plunge us into the limbo of the lost republics, unless we can inspire our youth with a controlling enthusiasm for an inward exaltation and beautifying of character, a passionate preference of mental power and spiritual purity to the splendors and coveted distinctions of place.

To avert the doom to which the Nemesis of history points, you, young men, must be fired with the lofty purpose, the imperishable ambition to become co-architects with the grand old builders of the past, who labored without reward upon the fabric of civilization which goes up through the centuries. In you is my hope,

"For I doubt not through the ages an increasing purpose runs,  
And the thoughts of men are widened by the process of the suns."

Our nation, more than all others I apprehend, demands thorough, practical education, not simply because, as a people, we have greater responsibilities laid upon us, but because we are more exposed to the tendencies of the age, than others. Cupidity is intensified by the unexampled resources and oppor-

tunities of the country, and by the increased productiveness given to labor by invention. Under these incentives we have become too anxious to do, to be thorough, and forego thinking for action. We have no time for treatises, and so substitute in their place a syllabus of hints. In the intervals of leisure we are too much exhausted for intellectual work, and so abandon ourselves to the recreations of romance and frivolous pleasures.

All this must be counteracted in the schools. A love of study and habits of exhaustive research must be laid in youth to overcome the opposite tendencies of manhood. This is the indispensable condition of national prosperity and power in the future.

The reasoning faculty is man's distinguishing characteristic. By it he discovers truth and enlarges the domain of human knowledge and activity. It is the instrument of his power. It gives him "dominion over the fish of the sea, and over the fowls of the air, and over every living thing that moveth upon the earth." The ox and the horse work out its volition as absolutely as the hand of man. By it, gravitation, heat, the winds, the waves, steam, lightning, all the great laws and forces of nature are subdued and harnessed to the ear of human progress. At its bidding they plant and reap, weave and stitch, delve in the earth and lift massive weights above it, interchange the products of States by sea and land, and outrun the light with messages of thought. It evolves through successive phases the civilization of the world, and determines the superior and the inferior, the master and the slave among men. Nations advance or recede as it is developed or dormant.

The ability to reason correctly upon given facts is the faculty of the merchant, the inventor, the commander, the statesman, and of every person who becomes a leader of society. A people are capable, self-reliant, enterprising and free, according as the whole approximate this condition.

From the earliest, until a comparatively recent period, a profound ignorance of nature, of history, and of human rights, brooded upon the people. The ability to deduce laws and

general principles, to rise to higher and broader ranges of truth from a few narrow premises, by a logical process, either formal or informal; to judge properly even of evidence, and reach an independent conclusion upon any question of duty, was beyond their reach. The few who could reason absorbed power and maintained it by perpetuating ignorance. They directed all military ventures, and were the proud, profligate masters of the state. The many were vassals, lived upon the coarsest fare and labored incessantly, by the rudest and hardest methods, for the indulgence of the arrogant few who claimed as a divine right the exclusive power which they had exercised through the general incapacity of society.

When purposes of trade had at length gathered men into towns, both interest and necessity induced independent thought and an interchange of views; the rivalries of business begat an increased activity of the popular intellect which enlarged the body of absolute knowledge and general intelligence; society unconsciously organized; positive theories were timidly advanced and political sentiments imperceptibly crystallized into policies; business enterprises and successful encounters with aristocratic arrogance imparted self-reliance and at last the idea of personal, and as a consequence, of popular rights dawned upon men. Public opinion, which in our day is omnipotent, was created and gathered heat and force from the masses, till it could dictate, in the interests of the people, independence of feudal lords and the establishment of small democracies.

In these first essays of self-government, the forum was the centre of popular intelligence, and the state was bounded by the limits of its influence; but after the invention of printing, the works of the best thinkers were slowly scattered abroad, and the inhabitants of outlying rural districts participated in the interchange of knowledge and ideas before enjoyed exclusively by a few centralized communities. Subsequent to this the promulgation of the representative principle rendered possible an extension of the democratic system, hitherto confined to a few cities, over large sections, and confederated states.

Thus rapidly tracing back the current of history, we see our republic rising slowly and painfully, like a Phœnix, from the ashes of perished centuries and civilizations. Its foundations rest in the bitter and bloody experiences of generations who struggled for rights into which only their latest descendants have been able to enter and enjoy as an inheritance by reversion. It was the offspring of centuries of experience, and must be perpetuated by the intelligence of its people. Let the schools and churches perish ; let but one or two generations lapse into ignorance, and our children will repeat the experience of the Greek and Venetian, who cringe, submissive mendicants upon the soil, where their fathers walked in the pride of power, the rich and accomplished masters of the world.

But to make liberty possible and arrest the decline of civil power by a constant diffusion of knowledge through a system of national schools, is not the only consideration which weighs upon us on an occasion like this. We can not here forget that the future greatness and glory of our country will be determined largely by the intellectual discipline and power of its educated men.

Impressed with this thought, I venture to submit to you who are now about to enter upon the larger duties and graver responsibilities of the scholars' work, and who will hereafter help to shape and sustain the educational polity of the country, some reflections drawn from an experience of twenty years of collegiate and public life. Hereafter you will realize, as now you can not, that they only who master their calling in its theory and practice, bear away its prizes ; that earnest, continuous study, within the limits of good health, is the condition of absolute success. Superficial men may be flippant and noisy, may rush confidently into the view of the public, demanding both its suffrages and applause, but they soon sink to their place in the unerring judgment of men, and rarely leave any lasting memorial of true greatness. No student ceases from his labors whose works follow him.

But by study I mean no aimless indulgence of a poetic fancy ; no listless dreaming in classic shades, but definite and

rapid mental work toward some real object to be secured, some great and noble purpose to be realized. Mental recreations even, should be so chosen as to tend to the improvement of the faculties; for young men going forth from these halls, here and now, to the professional duties of American scholars, cannot afford to indulge in an idle dalliance with pleasures which destroy the habit and power of sustained thought, and quench in the soul the inspiration of pure and lofty desires. A play of Shakspeare, or a poem by Dante, invigorates while it refreshes; but the beguiling fiction in which vice lurks like Cleopatra's asp in flowers, leaves a sensual poison in the imagination, and the fire of hell in the blood:

You will meet men in all the haunts of business, deprecating and sometimes sneering at the inutility and waste of the general culture of the schools. A slight acquaintance with these people will generally relieve you from the suspicion that they have suffered any personal inconvenience from the higher learning which they so much regret. Scholastic acquirements, it is true, can never be made a substitute for professional learning or the practiced skill of an artisan, but they liberalize and lift all professions and industries to a higher sphere, and impart to them a more extended utility than they could otherwise have. Learning makes a man a better farmer, a more skillful machinist, a more accomplished shipwright. It improves the character and multiplies the products of our national industry, and imparts to enterprise increased energy by opening new channels for its display. Science and invention have given to civilization its lucrative pursuits, its manifold comforts and elegant surroundings. The simple arts and rude discomforts of savage life are all that the untutored mind supplies to our hand.

Man draws mental nourishment from the fields of study, which, when digested, become part of his intellectual strength. Take one of the peerless orations of Burke and erase from it every vestige of scholarship; take from it the profound insight received from the teachings of history; the sharp analysis drawn from the dialectics of the schoolmen; strike out the

masculine vigor imparted by meditation upon the philosophy of government; the luxuriant, and often exquisite beauty poured into it from the classics, and how little will be left of that magnificent structure! Disrobe it of its learning and you can assign it no place in the list of oratory which the most gifted of English statesmen would not scorn to accept.

Turn to your princely merchant, whose combinations cover the whole field of commerce, whose fingers touch the markets of the world with the skill of a pianist, and whose returning ventures bring golden argosies to the coffers of the land; strike from his mind the accurate knowledge and comprehensive grasp derived from the close and protracted study of books and of business, and he would dwindle at once to a respectable huckster in some corner grocery.

This is the law of success, the secret of greatness in every pursuit; for the mind grows as the tree grows, and bears fruit by sucking up and transmuting into itself the elements of other natures.

But the vexed question of society to-day is, how and where-withal men shall be educated? This is a question which has been often and ably discussed, and I shall not, therefore, dwell upon it. The primary objects of education are discipline and knowledge. Now, as no man can exhaust, and but few secure, more than a fraction of what it would be well to know, wisdom would seem to dictate that we should pursue a curriculum calculated to secure both ends in one effort. None but an insane man would commend to his child the long and laborious study of astrology, or Hindoo philosophy, for the sake of discipline, when some useful branch would serve the same purpose. It is equally unreasonable to make any science or language, not of practical use, a part of a system of instruction unless specially fitted to develop the mental faculties. We cannot assume, however, that an ancient classic is dead and useless because unspoken. The Greek and Roman languages are largely the sources of the English, and in studying them we learn the force and capacity of our own tongue and acquire skill in its use.

Admitting that discipline and practical knowledge should be combined in a course of general training, still it is not easy to decide upon the order of studies best calculated to secure mental development. The child learns first the things and names of its own household, and as the circle of its life widens, it comprehends by degrees the neighborhood, the town, the state, the nation, and finally rises to historic and abstract truths. If this is the order in the school of nature, as I can not doubt it is, we should learn that first which is nearest to us, and which it most concerns us to know. I am not speaking of professional, but of general studies. It is more important that we should be familiar with the history of our own country, that we should understand the character of its institutions and people, and know the nature and extent of its resources and capacities, than that we should be learned in all the reigns of all the Cæsars. The student who can rehearse the story of Jason in search of the golden fleece has done well; but he who can trace to its final consumption a clipping of Iowa wool, has done better. The honors of the college are due to one who can analyze with skill the verse of Homer; but the world will pronounce him not less a scholar who has learned to analyze the soils which feed the people and pour their surplus into the lap of trade. The doctrines of Christianity will be found a more profitable acquisition for any profession than all the mythologies of the ancient world. I would not discourage an earnest and thorough study of the languages through which the genius of antiquity spoke to other and distant ages, but I would have the place of each branch in a system of liberal study determined by its relative importance, both as a discipline and a means of practical utility in the business of life.

But education, considered subjectively, rises above mere questions of æsthetics and utility into the range of psychology. The discipline and development of our powers result from their activity; but as the intellect feeds upon thought, the character of our mental structure will be determined measurably by the nature of our studies. I doubt not the old scholars ac-

quired as much strength and command of their faculties in the pursuit of alchemy and astrology as we in the study of chemistry and astronomy, but quite another type of character, quite a different order of civilization was produced from that which we possess. There was more credulity, more poetic mystery clustering about the Academy at Athens than the College at Grinnell, but less of faith and positive truth. The Greek excelled in taste, we in knowledge. He acquired a more finished culture by a careful and prolonged practice of his own living language than we by a brief and defective study of a foreign and dead one.

The Greek and Roman, more than modern tongues, impart the power of accurate thinking and of strength and perspicuity of expression. The Greek transfers to the student something of its own flexibility and peerless beauty; the Latin, something of the massive and judicial character impressed upon it by the Roman mind. But little of all this is realized by our defective methods. We torment a child before his time with Greek and Latin, syntax and analysis, when he should be learning to read and appreciate these languages. A mind must become disgusted and disabled by a forced and prolonged application to subjects which it can not comprehend. The same plan transferred to other branches would substitute the calculus for the mental arithmetic, a treatise upon the will for a primer of fables, would give to the novitiate in art a Guido or Rembrandt instead of a book of outlines and sketches. Our children learn to speak and think in English before they attempt to comprehend the philosophy of its structure. So do the children of *Athens*, to-day, study Greek. We shall never appreciate the profound thought and chastened beauty which flow through those incomparable tongues; shall never thrill with the life which surged in the comitia and thundered from the bema, till we go back to the simple methods which nature dictates. It is puerile to contend that a student painfully construing, lexicon in hand, his Latin prose or Greek verse, is cultivating his understanding or improving his taste. He is simply learning to read; and nothing but literary

fanaticism can make anything else of it. Can your child, who haltingly manages words of four syllables, sound the depths of Milton and fill his soul with the inspirations of that great master? No more can your college student, who does not read with ease the ancient languages, possess himself of the grand and subtle philosophies, the pure and exquisite taste of the classic models. I accord fully with the poet's glowing apostrophe to Greece:

"Long shall thine annals and immortal tongue  
Fill with thy fame the youth of many a shore.  
Boast of the aged; lesson of the young,  
Which sages venerate and bards adore,  
As Pallas and the Muse unveil their awful lore."

But it is only to those who have made that immortal tongue their own, as the poet had, to whom the prophecy of his song will be realized. "Drink deep or taste not the Pierian spring," is the poetic form of a very sound rule of common sense which should be impressed upon all who affect the classics.

Equally defective, I fear, is our method in the higher mathematics, looking simply to its effect upon the mind. A few pursue these branches with a view to their practical application to the more recondite sciences, but our general object is to strengthen the reasoning faculty and habituate it to close and logical forms. Now instead of throwing upon the student the work of discovering and expressing for himself the relations of abstract truths, we only require him to apprehend and repeat demonstrations prepared to his hand. This undoubtedly improves the memory and enlarges the knowledge of mathematical truth, but the mind fails to acquire the power of original ratiocination. I fear we do not realize the loss we sustain by this defect. Not one in a hundred of educated men ever has occasion for a practical use of the higher mathematics, but so far as they take part in the great duties of life, a daily necessity is laid upon them to employ the reasoning faculty which it is the object of the mathematics to discipline. To distinguish right from wrong, and to guide others to the

truth by sound and convincing logic, is the chief work of educated men. By the methods now suggested the scholars' acquisitions at first would be less rapid, but his *education* would advance with an accelerating speed, and his attainments at last put to shame his memorizing competitor.

Hamilton, Mill, Low, and other distinguished Englishmen who have given thought to the subject of popular and collegiate education, have insisted that pure mathematics, dealing only with necessary truth, is not so well calculated to prepare the mind to sift evidence and weigh probabilities, which is the incessant work of the intellect through life, as the moral and natural sciences. This undoubtedly is true if we are seeking simply facility and good judgment in the use of the kind of evidence with which we have to do mainly in practical life. Hence the great utility, I had almost said the indispensable necessity, of drilling our youth in logic, political and natural sciences, and whatever other departments of study will prepare them to judge correctly of partial or conflicting testimony. This is an essential preparation for wise and independent action when they shall have passed to the duties and responsibilities of men.

But the discipline of the mathematics underlies this part of our education, and is designed to impart mental strength and a habit of direct and compact action. "If a man's wit be wandering," says my Lord Bacon, "let him study the mathematics; for in demonstrations, if his wit be called away never so little, he must begin again. If his wit be not apt to distinguish or find differences, let him study the schoolmen; for they are *cymini sectores*, (splitters of hairs.) If he be not apt to beat over matters, and to call up one thing to prove and illustrate another, let him study the lawyers' cases. So every defect of the mind may have a special receipt."

Without dwelling longer upon the subjects of study, let me impress upon you the importance of *thoroughness*. The want of this is the great defect in our American system. I utter the unanimous voice of professional and business men who have felt in their own experience the irreparable loss of those

elementary branches which constitute the body of popular education in our country. If the foundations are loosely or defectively laid in childhood, however cunningly and compactly you may put up the later superstructure, you will, through life, feel the insecurity of the whole fabric, and be deprived of half your conscious strength. You may be sure, as Sheridan was, that power is in you; but, unlike him, you will be unable to bring it out, and will be perpetually tantalized with splendid possibilities, impossible for you to reach. I would counsel the young man who is conscious of a defective early education to work backward and not forward, for he will find hereafter superficial knowledge nearly useless when there is any thing to be done, and will never be able to do as a man what he left undone as a boy.

Finally, make your learning practical. A scholar without the aptitude and self-reliance which come from intercourse with men, is like a paralytic who sees what should be done but has no power to do it. While he waits for the moving of the waters, an inferior of practical skill steps in before him, and is made whole.

As American scholars you have no right to be exclusive; no right to withdraw from any of the legitimate functions flowing from our democratic institutions. Mingle with men. Get experience, but retain your purity. Test your own knowledge by the learning of others. Acquire facility and skill in the application of your superior attainments by practice. Go to the market, the workshop, the caucus, the forum, and wherever men do congregate, and secure that knowledge of affairs essential to every American's education. This contact with the world, by opening to you the practical relations of theoretical knowledge, will energize your capacity for scholarly attainments, and link you early by strong and indissoluble sympathies with the toiling masses to whose service you have been set apart. Correct and enlarge your views without servility, in the light of public sentiment; drive from your mind all the "idols of the Tribe, the Cave and the Market-place," by letting in that strong common sense which is the offspring of experience rather than philosophy.

Let no false pride, no monkish cant, take possession of your souls. The young man who is afraid of soiling either his garments or his manners by contact with the masses, is sadly in want either of brains or experience; and he who is too pure to participate with his fellow-men in honorable politics or business, has mistaken sentiment for piety. Cloistered seclusion and aristocratic exclusiveness are treason to the scholarship of the republic. Your superior attainments impose upon you the duty of public service. If your learning has been accurate, and your discipline thorough, you are prepared to become the guides rather than the slaves of popular opinions and passions. To level artificial distinctions and factitious castes by lifting all to the height of your own intelligence, to purge away the barbarism which lingers in the highest civilization, to infuse a spirit of justice into the business and politics of the country, to maintain the purity of national character and lift the aspirations of men to the attainment of a nobler life, is your transcendent mission. All the professions, all the social forces and instruments of public influence, are at your command. Let your task become your pleasure, and your work will be well done. Mental power will be enhanced by the thought bestowed upon the discharge of duty, and your sphere in the life-battle with evil rise as you advance. Make your lives an example to instigate to high purpose and generous effort other generations of scholars whom you will welcome, as to-day we welcome you, to the fraternity of intellectual benefactors. Do not join the mournful company who talk darkly of decline and chant the "*De profundis*" over perished hopes and lost opportunities, but inspired with the vision of a future more glorious than the past, move upon the intrenchments of error with invincible purpose, and do deeds that shall make your Alma Mater grateful that your names are enrolled among her children.

## ARTICE II.

## A PHILOSOPHY OF THE VOICE.

All human art has been suggested to man by the art of God. Because God first made man out of the dust of the earth, the sculptor makes man from quarried rock :

" Fair-statured, noble, like an awful thing  
Frozen upon the very verge of life,  
And looking back along Eternity  
With rayless eyes, that keep the shadow Time."

Because God first laid the beams of His chambers in the waters, and spanned above them the arching heavens, man has busied himself with his St. Peter's and St. Sophia's, in imitation of Nature's vast cathedral without. Because God first painted the landscape, and the water and the sky, man, with his palette and brush, has been seeking to transfer their beauties to the canvas. And it is precisely so with the art of music. The vast number and variety of musical instruments which men have invented, have sprung from the suggestions of the Creator embodied in His creatures. If we could bring within hearing of one human ear the notes of birds, the cry of animals, wild and tame, the sound of waterfalls, the crashing of trees, the echoing of the avalanche, the rumbling of the thunder, the dashing of the ocean, Nature would seem to us one vast conservatory of music, and it would seem as though the heavens were arched above us to furnish a fitting audience-chamber to the innumerable concourse of performers.

And yet, like all the thoughts of God, how simple the original idea of sound. In addition to the other wonderful qualities of the atmosphere, to its peculiar alchemy, its proportion of parts, its transparency for the eye, its purity for the lungs, we find that if the air be set into vibrations, its waves will beat

upon the ear—upon the shell-shaped shore of man's physical being—like the waves of water upon the shore of the sea, with a musical note. This very breath that man inhales for the purification of his life-currents—converting the useful, the vital into beauty—he may pour out vocalized into sweet sounds, syllabled into articulate words; he may pour out the language of his soul, unsyllabled, without words. For music, without words, is the language of the soul.

Man is the perfection of God's works. The human hand, the human foot, is at the head of this class of organs. The naturalist will tell you the hand of man, unlike the corresponding member of inferior animals, is intended for delicate mechanic arts; that the foot of man is constructed for walking upright, so as to leave the hands unemployed. It is natural, therefore, to presume, that the organs of speech in man will be susceptible of the very highest degree of perfection; that man's facilities for converting the air he breathes into musical notes will be superior to those of other animals; and for perfection and variety of effect I suppose this to be true.

In the use of the voice in forth pouring these musical vibrations, the office of the lungs is different from their office in the mere act of inhalation. In breathing we use the lungs involuntarily. In speaking or singing we use them under volition. We convert them into bellows, like the bellows of the organ, to furnish air to be vocalized—to be converted into voice. And, in order that the column of air be equal and steady, these bellows must always be full, or must have the effect of fullness. Inhalations, therefore, must be made at once, instantaneously. Exhalations are to be prolonged according to the necessities of the speaker. And the expulsion must be equal, steady, strong; never spasmodic. And in this steady furnishing of air the lungs should not endure the strain. They should be sustained by the muscles of his sides. In his *De Senectute*, Cicero makes Cato, at eighty-four, claim, not that his lungs, but that his *sides*, the outer covering of the lungs, the muscles which sustain them—are their base, were as strong as in youth. In order to a proper use of the lungs in speaking or singing, the very

first moral quality requisite is *self-possession*. Nervousness makes the breathing spasmoidic; and that kind of breathing tires—has no strong, lateral support of the muscles. The speaker or singer, instead of being furnished with a volume of air which, from his skillful inhalations, is inexhaustible, is constantly panting for breath like the hunted animal.

The next requisite in proper use of the voice is, that all the air thus furnished by the lungs be vocalized—be converted into sound; that there be no excess of air forced into the vocal organs, and that all that passes through them be converted into perfect voice. The organs of the throat make the air exhaled into music. All air that passes through them unvocalized is unmusical, is still *breath*. The habit of forcing unvocalized air through the vocal organs—injures them; roughens and ridges them. The texture of these organs is very delicate. They are, therefore, very sensitive to injury. Besides, unvocalized breath roughens, aspirates the tone; makes the *voice* husky and harsh; puts qualities into it, which are there irrespective of the will and the character of the sentiment. You often hear public speakers saying things the most beautiful and tender, in tones of voice so faulty as to nullify or make ridiculous all they say, so much unvocalized breath passes through their organs of speech. The effect of the vocal organs upon the column of air exhaled is to set it into vibrations; and if more is exhaled than can be made to vibrate, it roughens and renders indistinct the tone.

The next step in the process of speaking or singing, after the breath has been properly exhaled and converted into tone, is properly to *locate* that tone within the chamber of the mouth. There is a proper place on which to touch the strings of a violin with the bow, on which to strike with the fingers the chords of a harp or guitar, on which should fall the stroke of the tongue in a bell. So, there is a place well located, well furnished within the human mouth, for the *focus of vibration*, where the vibrations of sound should unite before utterance. Some public speakers never firmly locate their tone. In a single sentence, the focus of vibration will be made to vary two or

three times, two or three degrees. They seem to think that upon this *variation* in the location of the *ictus*, depends all variation in the notes of the voice. But, just as the violinist retains the same locality for the stroke of his bow, even though he pass his fingers up and down upon the strings, changing the key of the note, so in the human voice, the *focus of vibration* remains the same, whatever the contraction or relaxation of the vocal chords, whether the note uttered be high or low. Ventriloquists throw the focus of vibration into the throat, locating the tone on the soft palate of the mouth, or within the thoracic cavity; but no man can speak or sing thus for any length of time without serious injury. The hard palate of the mouth is especially adapted to be this focus of vibration. It lines chambered bone. A *certain* stroke upon it gives no *uncertain* sound, injures no delicate tissues.

But a man may know how to use his lungs as a bellows, may be able to convert all his breath into voice, may be able accurately to locate tone, and yet fail as a distinct public speaker or singer. He must be skillful also in *articulation*. There is an uncertain use of a man's fingers on the orifices and keys of a flute, that defeats all well-defined and clear playing. So definiteness and distinctness of utterance in speaking depend upon something exterior to the organs of sound. The sound is perfectly *formed*. In what shape shall it come out of the mouth? Shall it be pure, round tone, or shall it be minted and stamped with the image and super-scription of speech? Shall it be articulated, syllabled? All effort toward articulation, toward distinctness of utterance, belongs to the tongue, the teeth, the lips. These *chop up* the golden bars of breath, of pure sound, of vocalized air, and mint them into *speech*. The throat ought not to be exercised to reach distinctness of speech. Its effort should be to convert the air furnished into pure tone. The *lungs* should not be exercised to reach distinctness of speech. *Their* effort should be directed toward providing this unbroken column of pure air. The office that remains for the tongue, teeth and lips, is that of articulation, that of giving form and shape to tone.

Finally, perfect vocalization of the air, the location of the tone and its articulation should be *simultaneous*. The effect of furnishing more air than is vocalized, is to aspirate and render disagreeable the tone. The result of a failure properly to locate the tone, gives uncertainty of utterance, injures the organs. The effect of a failure to make vocalization and articulation simultaneous, is to interrupt utterance. Vocalization overtakes and checks articulation. The speaker stumbles from his excessive haste. The leg of vocalization trips against the leg of articulation, and he falls. As in walking or running, the limbs must move simultaneously, and thus get out of each others' way, so in the progress of the breath in articulation. In order to make its egress gracefully, in order to be fitly spoken, or fitly sung, to be apples of gold in pictures of silver, articulation must be simultaneous with vocalization.

The organs of speech are really a musical instrument, through which a living soul utters itself in tone, in syllabled language. It is a great advantage to learn it as a musical instrument, as a flute or a piano. The great difficulty in the cool and scientific use of the voice arises from treating it as a part of ourselves, and not as a mechanism of our Creator, through which we operate. A pupil's performance upon an instrument, a piano or an organ, may be very much impaired by an intense self-consciousness, by over anxiety, by nervousness. How much more so, when the living texture, the nerves and muscles of this instrument, are a part of himself. If a speaker or singer be over-anxious, this affects the rapidity and length of his breath. Instead of their moving with a grand and quiet movement, like the long swell of the sea, he pants; he articulates with his jaws, his throat, his chest; he is no longer master of his instrument. Its various parts conflict, impede each other. Embarrassed physically, he soon becomes mentally embarrassed, and does just as badly as in his nervousness he was afraid he should do. On the other hand, the man who employs his voice as a musical instrument, makes it the channel, the vehicle, through which he pours forth the utterance of a living soul—treats it as no part of him-

self, except for utterance, for expression, to accomplish results, to make impressions, to change institutions, and to move men.

The variety of use which men make of the *tongue* is thus described by one of the sacred writers. "Therewith bless we God, even the Father; and therewith curse we men, which are made in the similitude of God." As great a variety of use is made of the human voice. We speak here only of vocal language, not *intellectual*, not *moral*. This wonderful instrument, through which our soul speaks and sings, is God's mechanism. Do we owe nothing to Him in the way of its cultivation? Its susceptibilities are ours to develop. What they are, only culture will disclose. Should a friend lay upon our table an elegant silver flute, could we neglect the instrument without neglecting him? Should he place in our parlor a piano or an organ, would it be honorable to him if we satisfied ourselves with no knowledge or mastery of the instrument? Of the voice we are compelled to make *some* use; why should it not be a skillful use? In talking, in reading, in speaking, in singing, why should not our homes, our schools, our churches, be filled with sweet sounds? Why should not "everything that hath breath," and power to make it into voice, "praise the Lord"? Why should our voices be as though Nature's journeyman had made us, and not made us well?

## ARTICLE III.

## DR. HAWES AS A PREACHER.

From the time when Dr. Hawes first decided on the Christian ministry, preaching was the uppermost thought with him. This, more than anything else, formed his character, and gave its impress to his people, and, so far as he was able, to the times in which he lived. "To be accounted worthy to preach the Gospel," he wrote, "is the highest honor for which I pant, the only object for which I would spend my strength and life."

"Go preach the Gospel," came as a commission from the Master directly from heaven, and to obey was both a necessity and a delight. He might, perhaps, fail, but he felt it was divinely decreed that he should try. This feeling was as a fire in his bones. He began lay-preaching almost as soon as he commenced his preparation for college; and he continued it, as he had opportunity, while studying and teaching, as well as in his vacations. When engaged as an assistant in Phillips' Academy, he wrote, to a friend: "School-keeping is not my chosen employment; it is foreign to the great object of my life, and I can not, therefore, be happy in it."

His attention was early drawn to the Apostle Paul as a model, and of one of his first-written sermons, he says: "I have lately been meditating a discourse on the character of Paul as a preacher. It has been running in my mind all day, and has so seized my thoughts, that I can not get rid of it." A few days later he writes: "I have been reading the epistles of Paul with two objects in view—one, to learn the character of the apostle as a preacher; the other, to discover by what means he learned that most important lesson—contentment. If I succeed in drawing his character as a preacher, I can not but hope it will be of use to me as well as to others. It seems to me, that in this respect he is perfect. It is a more difficult task than I imagined. But I love him more than ever, and

feel more desirous to imitate him in zeal, fidelity and plainness in dispensing the Word."

The analysis of Dr. Hawes as a preacher discloses the following as regulative or formative ideas:

First, he felt that the great object of the Gospel is the restoration of men, as sinners, to God and holiness, through Christ. The first sermon he preached in the Seminary was on "The Dominion of the Heart over the Intellect," from Luke 24: 41, "They believed not for joy." "In composing this sermon," he says, "I often offered up the prayer that my simple object in every discourse I wrote might be to win souls to Christ, and to feed his sheep and lambs."

Next to this, came his feeling of dependence for success in preaching on the efficacy of *prayer*. He never left his study to preach without prayer. He never went to a lecture or prayer-meeting, when the circumstances would permit, without prayer. He had a profound faith in the influence of the Holy Spirit on preacher and hearers, as the only life-giving power of the Gospel, and the cause of real success in preaching.

Then, he was thoroughly bent on so preaching as to make an *impression*. In his preparatory studies, he met with the motto of John Knox: "Spare no arrows." "This," he said, "I have inscribed upon my forehead, and intend to make the rule of my action. I would not only spare no arrows, but I would take heed not to blunt their points by wrapping them in silk or satin. I would have them sharp, naked, and *barbed* too, that they should not only enter, but *stick*."

To get as much *truth* as possible before his people, and, in as plain a way, was a ruling thought with him. From his settlement in the ministry, more and more did the question press on him, how to preach so as to satisfy the educated and the uneducated, and best meet the wants of the entire congregation. While riding to New Haven alone in his carriage, and pondering the same problem, "this text," he says, "came to my mind: 'Light is sweet, and a pleasant thing it is to see the sun.' With the text came the comment I made upon it—

truth, God's truth especially, is, and must be, *eternally* interesting to the mind of man; and if I can succeed in getting that truth before the minds of my people, I shall not fail to interest and instruct all classes of them, be their cultivation and tastes and habits ever so dissimilar. This, then, shall be the great leading object of my preaching: I will get as much of God's truth into my sermons as I can; and I will aim to express it in language so plain and simple as to convey it in the most direct manner into the minds of my hearers, and lodge it there. Truth, God's truth, pure, unmixed with human speculations, just as I find it in the Bible,—that shall be the staple of my preaching; and language and metaphor and figure and all else shall be held subservient to this one aim: getting God's truth before the minds of my people so that they shall see and understand it."

Further, it was a principle early adopted and never abandoned, that *all* his time and strength were not too much for his work as a Gospel preacher. Hence he kept entirely clear of all diverting avocations, and everything not directly connected with his calling. His authorship was confined almost exclusively to the republication of his sermons. One thing to do, one thing to care for, one thing to think of, was his motto; and that one thing was preaching. "If I do not experience some very great change in my present taste and resolutions," he wrote while preparing for the ministry, "I am confident I shall never secularize the sacred office, nor, in connection with preaching the Gospel, engage in any worldly pursuits."

The dominancy of these ideas explains much of the real popularity and success of Dr. Hawes as a preacher. To drop God's truth as seed, into man's heart as the soil, and pray God's Spirit to make it spring and grow and bear fruit, this was his great work. He did not require splendid talents, vast stores of learning, profound philosophy, to do what, with these ideas, God enabled him to accomplish, but only the right use of just the talents and opportunities God furnished him with.

This accounts for that remarkable succession of revivals

during his ministry which he called his "harvest seasons," and those frequent intervals when a few would come to his study, one by one, or in groups, to inquire the way into the kingdom—"silent dew-drops of grace," as he designates them.

Among the accessories of this pulpit power of the Hartford preacher was :

1st. His transparent *honesty*. This was something more than sincerity, and something broader and deeper than mere convictions. It was a thorough uprightness of purpose and feeling, an open, social and moral fairness, in treating both his subject and his auditors. Every one saw and felt that he had no dupery nor duplicity, no guile nor trap to catch men with, nothing but truth, intelligence and love. There was a radical force in this self-oblivious presentation of the great glad tidings. It tended to disarm prejudice. It elicited confidence, and propitiated favor for both the preacher and his doctrine. There was no affectation, no pretence of any kind. He hated self-conceit, flashiness, and sham every where, but most of all in the pulpit.

2d. A natural and attractive *awkwardness* often gave effect to his preaching. It was attractive because so exceedingly awkward, and it had a kind of gracefulness because so perfectly natural and easy. It was, in part, a something born with him, and in part a habit acquired at the anvil. It illustrated his own rule, "What is easy and natural, is not only better understood, but is always more pleasing and impressive."

In his energetic passages, when he kindled into enthusiasm, there was now a sledge-hammer swing of the long arm, and now a Vulcan-like stroke of the heavy hand. Then, in some transition or check of thought, would come a sudden pushing out of the large open palms, with an emphatic ejaculation: "Pause! my hearers, pause!"

It is a physical law, that magnetic forces flow most freely in curved lines. But there was a kind of charm in the earnest, artless angularity of Dr. Hawes' pulpit action and manner, which was sometimes singularly sharp and effective. It served

to keep off drowsiness from his hearers, and to excite their curiosity, if nothing more; often it drew and fixed their attention on what was uttered. He laid no claim to a polished manner or finished elocution, though he highly prized these in those who knew how to use them. He thoroughly reprobated all theatrical gymnastics and pulpit bombastry. With a voice clear, strong and easily modulated, he never resorted to elocutionary thunder, for he knew that it is the lightning which strikes, and not the noise.

3d. Propriety, simplicity and perspicuity were accessory elements in the effectiveness of Dr. Hawes as a preacher. A careful examination of his sermons, manuscript and published, discloses these as marked qualities in his style. Mere propriety is not an attractive feature of style, or of any thing else, though marked improprieties are very conspicuous blemishes. Nor does perspicuity always pass among sermon hearers and readers at its real value. Those who make deep things clear, and the difficult plain and easy, are often mistaken for simpletons, instead of profound thinkers. When the right words fall into their place naturally, as if they grew there, and no wrong ones appear; when each word and sentence performs its own part and helps others to perform theirs, in the clear and concise expression of thought, the simplicity and naturalness constitute a fundamental excellence in sermonizing.

This combination of qualities in more than an ordinary degree marks the discourses of Dr. Hawes. They had in them nothing explosive or startling, and they produced no shock. Hence he was never regarded as a sensational, not often admitted as a striking preacher. He did not abound in imagery and figures, though he was very far from ignoring them, as Calvin and Emmons did. Rosettes he eschewed entirely, and made a spare use of roses and other flowers of rhetoric. No empty elegancies or mere platitudes found their way into his discourses. He was never dazzling, never flashy, but there are many passages of quiet beauty and comprehensive effectiveness. He never rushed along, like a locomotive, on a stiff, straight iron track, though his mind sometimes moved rapidly

in the broad highways of thought. If he never went up like a rocket, sometimes, like a skillful aeronaut, he would bear on the wings of his words a whole assembly of eager listeners up into the purer regions of his own spiritual elevations. The secret of this kind of pulpit effectiveness is found in these two brief canons of Dr. Emmons:

"1st. Have you any thing to say!

"2d. Say it."

An acute critic and a good judge of sermons and sermonizers wrote, in 1854, of Dr. Hawes: "He appeals more to the judgment and understanding than the passions, or even intellect. He seldom advances new ideas, but old Christian truths are clothed in an attractive form, and presented with a force and power of illustration and argument seldom heard. Dr. Hawes seems never to use a superfluous word, and never repeats an idea. You feel, in listening to him, that he has not half exhausted his subject, or his power to treat it, and that he could not have used fewer words, or words that would more fitly express and give point and force to his thought.

He was an original writer, in the sense of not being an imitator. His style was peculiarly his own, the result, as appears from the testimony of his classmates and his own journal, of great care and labor. The material of his sermons was also his own, as much as anybody's else, though he did not bring it "from afar." He got it out of the Bible, out of history, out of nature, and his own experience. He picked it up at ministers' meetings, parish calls, in conversation and in the by-ways of life. He bought it, he borrowed it, he would even steal it out of the heads of his neighbors and brother ministers—anything, so that he might use it as acquisition for the good of his fellow-men. The apostle had said: "All things are yours," and he laid claim to his property wherever he could find it, and had a use for it.

4th. Dr. Hawes' sympathy with Christ as a Saviour, and with his fellow-men as sinners, more than any thing else was the secret of his pulpit power. This gave him confidence in the Gospel as a remedy, and earnestness and skill in applying

it. He was a man of deep feeling, though not a sentimental. His attachments as a husband, father and pastor were exceedingly strong, and his faith in Christ drew him, by the force of his entire emotional nature to Him, in a personal friendship. It made him one with Christ in his whole redeeming work. He believed most undoubtedly in the Gospel, as just what man in his lost state needs, and in his divine commission to preach it. This removed all timidity and kept out apathy. It made him both bold and earnest in proffering this Gospel, and gave him a hearty love for his work as a preacher.

Hence his ardor was not an intermittent fever, but a deep, all-pervading fervor of soul. It glowed in the preparation of his discourses as well as their delivery, and gave them a double birth—one in the study and the other in the pulpit.

He uttered himself boldly, because he took the Bible as his law-book as well as his text-book; and he spake "as one having authority," because he spake "not in the words which man's wisdom teacheth, but which the Holy Ghost teacheth." He tendered God's offers of mercy with no fear of disappointment in those who accept them; and the terrible force of Divine judgments, pronounced upon the persistently rebellious, came from his "Thus saith the Lord." How could he, then, have any patience with the modern progressive school, which takes its Gospel from the intuitions of the preacher, the newspaper, or the spirit of the age, and is ever newly adjusting the Bible to its ceaseless mutations? He felt with Neander, that "the true dignity of the preacher is in being simply the organ of the Divine Word, and nothing else. His glory is that it is not he who speaks, but "God who speaks by him."

He could not, therefore, compromise either his character or his doctrine. He could not soften the hard things of the Gospel to suit the capricious ears of covetous or epicurean sinners. He was not a mercurial polemic; but he would not flee like a hireling from the conflict with false doctrine; when rationalists and sentimentalists were leaving no refuge for the truth but the pulpit, and when it had been driven from so many pulpits. "I have been aware," he says, "that the inculcation

of some of the doctrines and duties on which I have much insisted, was little adapted to excite admiration or win applause; but I trust I can truly say that it has not been so much my object to please my hearers as to save them; not so much to gain their good opinion as to stand approved of my God and Judge. \* \* I have not preached philosophy, nor metaphysics, nor poetry, nor fiction, nor science; but I have aimed to preach the Gospel, and to preach it plainly and fully."

Of a certain style of flowery, sensational preaching, he says: "It wants entirely the elements of pulpit power; it wants truth; it wants weight of thought; it wants real sincerity and earnestness; and the people sitting under its soft and delicately exciting ministries remain as unmoved, as unaffected on spiritual things, as the dead when the nightingale sings, or the gentle breezes of summer pass over their graves.

"Many ministers of the present day," said Daniel Webster, "take their text from St. Paul, and preach from the newspapers. When they do so, I prefer to enjoy my own thoughts, rather than to listen. I want my pastor to come to me in the spirit of the Gospel, saying: 'You are mortal; your probation is brief; your work must be done speedily. You are immortal, too; you are hastening to the bar of God! the Judge standeth before the door.' When I am thus admonished, I have no disposition to muse or to sleep."

When Turner, the great painter, was asked by a lady the secret of his success, "Labor, madam," was his reply—"labor." Dr. Hawes was a most laborious student in the matter of preaching. He employed all his talents, acquisitions and skill in the arrangement and composition of his sermons, yet did not trust to latent acquisitions or skill for effect, but relied solely on God. And God honored this reliance. When in college, he was called a "plodder," a "dig;" and some who thought themselves geniuses laughed at him. But the plodders are the only real geniuses.

Says one, who knew him well in all the intimacies of ministerial and brotherly communion: "It would gratify the friends of Dr. Hawes if I could tell them how few times in the inter-

course of thirteen years I went to his house and found him out of his study, when in health; or in his study and away from his writing table; or at his writing table and employed with any thing but the ceaseless and ever-agreeable work of making sermons. Ten years after I left Hartford, I was making an annual visit at the parsonage in Grove street. The care of the Centre Church pulpit no longer demanded the service of brain or pen. But as I opened the study door, there sat the tireless and incessant writer, and under his even-paced quill, an old discourse was acquiring new freshness and symmetry and strength. What he would do with it when finished, he could not predict—had not asked. But work, and work at sermons was to him what the flowing of its current is to the Connecticut river. I am not certain that he could perform as much intellectual labor in an hour or a week as some other men. But I should hardly know where to look for the thinker or writer who could keep weariness at a greater distance, or fill thirty consecutive years with a larger number of laborious days."

In 1859, Dr. Hawes delivered a discourse before the Congregational Board of Publication. There was nothing brilliant in it, nothing particularly striking, yet it was a remarkably suggestive and productive discourse. It was a seed dropped into the soil of Congregationalism that sprang up, and six years later bore as fruit the National Congregational Council, and seems likely to bear, as still further fruit, a stated National Conference.

Among the things essential to the improvement and extension of Congregationalism, he discusses a ministry trained to the spirit and wants of the times. Of our present course of ministerial training, he asks:

"Does it not tend to cultivate the intellect rather than the heart? to make preaching literary and scholar-like rather than evangelical and searching? In a word, does it not savor more of the school of Gamaliel than of Christ, more of high literary culture than of a deep, mellow-toned earnest purpose to convert souls? The preaching of our day, it is admitted, is

more learned and tasteful and accomplished than formerly; but it is less bold, direct and home in its dealings with the souls of men; its topics are more multiform and varied, but less fraught with evangelical truth and doctrine; are discussed more elegantly, but less impressively; in a style more elaborate and finished, but less suited to reach the sensibilities, stir the deep springs of feeling and action in the inner man. Instead of coming right out in the strength of God, with the naked sword of the Spirit to do battle with sin and weakness, it is common for the preaching which naturally grows out of the present process of culture to study to be ingenious, original and elegant—to deliver literary sermons, great sermons, popular sermons. To this end, instead of confining itself within its proper commission—that of delivering God's message in God's way—it ranges abroad to find novel and strange subjects, and seeks to handle them in a new and original way, decking them in tropes and figures and all fine things,—just suited to make the whole exhibition elegant and popular, it may be, but utterly ineffective and powerless. Preaching, it seems to me, often fails of effect because it does not aim at effect. It stops in itself, is satisfied with making a sermon and delivering it, but does not aim so to construct it and point and push it home as to make it felt by the hearer. It is not enough addressed to man as man, has not enough of the lawyer-like method of arguing with jury in order to get the case. It is too abstract, too artificial, too much in the style of an essay or dissertation, stopping with the proof, but not applying what has been proved. This is like erecting a battery, loading the guns, and then spiking them, lest they should do execution in the ranks of the enemy."

Preaching, like dress, to some extent, is a matter of caprice and fashion. As to style and manner, it changes according to the ideas of some popular metropolitan or the appetite of auditors who can relish little except spicy or witty lectures. What the amateurs at one time applaud, they will not tolerate, from disgust, at another. "It is feeble or perfunctory," they say; "it is old, and out of fashion." Some, more open, and, per-

haps, more honest, admit that they dislike equally a good sermon and a poor one, for they object alike to the basis of both. It is the evangelical doctrine and duties that offend them, and not feebleness or false logic in preaching.

The best answer to these epicures and objectors that the pulpit can bring, Dr. Hawes felt, is to insist most earnestly and discriminatingly on the great principles of the Gospel; to meet directly the skepticism and folly of men by that which is the wisdom and power of God. He deprecated only that clerical culture which removes the preacher from the masses. "The pulpit," he said, "must keep in advance of the pews in learning and intelligence, if it would hold its proper position as a leading and moulding agency. He would not separate the subject-matter of preaching from science and philosophy, provided they are made to give support and prominence to the purely Gospel message. The sermon, he thought, as a general thing, should be more doctrinal, and at the same time more practical; simple in method, plainer, more elastic, and yet weightier with the solid substance of Bible truth; more the *very* word, and less upon or round about it. The reader of many books, the preacher may be, but he *must* be emphatically a man of faith in that one book—the Bible. He must know its truth and sovereignty by his own deep experience; then, the Gospel would not come forth so timidly and sparingly from the pulpit to the pews, sometimes in such apologetic terms. Then preaching would come to the people with the force of a divine revelation, and the preacher carry with him the might of a living Gospel. His glory is in being himself nothing, and in making Christ every thing."

The success of Dr. Hawes as a preacher is the best practical commendation of his views and principles of preaching. It is reported, that shortly after the Unitarian worship was commenced in their elegant church in Hartford, a member of the new society, meeting one of Dr. Hawes' parishioners, said, a little boastingly: "We have in our church a mahogany pulpit, and you only a pine one in yours." "Yes," was the

response, "But our pine pulpit don't harm our mahogany preacher, and your mahogany one don't help your pine preacher."

A sermon that Dr. Hawes preached on Universalism was published, and a copy sent to his old master, who was of that persuasion. A neighbor asked him what he thought of it. "Oh," he said, "it is Joel all over. It made no difference with him whether he got hold of a new piece of cloth or an old one, it was, 'Go ahead.'"

His dislike for any thing that looked like mere sensational preaching was very strong. "One Monday morning I met him," said a brother minister, "and having learned that he had help from New York the day before, I adverted to it. He quickly replied: 'There are a great many ways of going to hell, and flashy preaching is one of them.'"

His love for preaching, which was a passion, continued to the last. An old parishioner met him one Monday morning returning from his Sabbath labors, as he had done several successive Mondays. "I stopped him," he says, "and addressed to him this question: 'Doctor, do you continue to preach every Sunday?' Straightening himself up to his full height, his eyes glowing with the enthusiasm of his younger days, and with a voice of pleasant earnestness he said: 'To be sure I do; why should I be laid up on the shelf?' I asked him if he loved to preach then as well as at any former period. 'Certainly, I do,' was the answer." And he continued to preach to within the last four days of his life.

## ARTICLE IV.

## ARGYLL'S "REIGN OF LAW."\*

We feel that justice has not yet been done this treatise by the religious literature of the country. It is one of the noblest contributions of our times to theological science. We only hope that our brief discussion may contribute somewhat toward providing for the American edition a more numerous audience.

The leading idea of the work before us is, that law runs throughout the Kosmos — through mind as well as matter. The Reign of Law! What is it? Skepticism uses the expression as a battery behind which it claims to find its surest defence. Science has been making discoveries and formulating facts, showing order and regularity in the system of the universe, and it is asserted that the idea of the reign of law has swept away, or will sweep away, the reign of faith. Argyll has reconnoitred this position of skepticism. His work has been well done. Is it too much to say that he has captured the position and turned its guns? His method of treatment can not be too strongly recommended to all who would undertake the defence of religion. Instead of flying in the face of science and denying its facts, he has the rather asked, What is the meaning of all these facts and systems of facts which science has discovered and formulated? What is the meaning of this established order? What is the meaning of this reign of law? What does it signify?

The conclusion of Argyll's argument is, that "Law is simply the form in which the purpose of the Everlasting Will is expressed." His argument is approached by a definition of law, and an illustration of the different senses in which that term is used in science. Five different significations are carefully

\* The Reign of Law. By the Duke of Argyll. First American from the fifth London Edition, 1870. DeWitt C. Lent & Co., New York.

distinguished. These definitions ought to be as familiarly known as the multiplication table or the scale in music, to avoid bewilderment from the different senses in which the word is used. His definitions are as follows:

"First. We have law as applied simply to an observed order of facts.

"Secondly. To that order as involving the action of some force or forces of which nothing more may be known.

"Thirdly. As applied to individual forces, the measure of whose operations has been more or less defined or ascertained.

"Fourthly. As applied to those combinations of force which have reference to the fulfilment of purpose or the discharge of function.

"Fifthly. As applied to abstract conceptions of the mind—not corresponding with any actual phenomena, but deduced therefrom as axioms of thought necessary to our understanding of them. Law, in this sense, is a reduction of the phenomena, not merely to an order of facts, but to an order of thought."

These definitions—which we must dismiss without illustration—are an Ithuriel spear with which one needs ever to arm himself when he enters that great realm of philosophy which is building up about natural science. Whoever will read Herbert Spencer in their light, will see that his system of philosophy, universal as it claims to be, is but partial in character; that it is built on the basis of the first three definitions, leaving out of account the principles underlying the fourth and fifth. But these latter significations are a part of the body of thought which is covered by the term law. It is hard to conceive why Mr. Spencer passes them by, unless it be because of the inevitable theistic inferences to which they give rise. No matter what they suggest, they are too thoroughly incorporated into the idea of law to be disposed of by simply ignoring them. Argyll meets squarely in front the idea which skepticism so often puts forward, to wit, that every thing is governed by immutable force. "*There are no phenomena visible to man, of which it is true to say that they*

are governed by any invariable force. That which does govern them is always some variable combination of invariable forces."

Perhaps it may be well to group a few extracts, taken here and there from the book, around the idea above expressed. "It is perfectly true that every law is, in its own nature, invariable, producing always precisely and necessarily the same effects; that is, provided it is worked under the same conditions. But then, if the conditions are not the same, the invariableness of effect gives place to capacities of change which are almost infinite." "Let it be observed that in all the senses in which the word law is used there is only one in which it is true that laws are immutable and invariable, and that is the sense in which law is used to designate an individual force. \* \* \* But in all the other senses in which the word law is used, laws are not immutable, but on the contrary they are the great instruments, the unceasing agencies of change. There is no observed order of facts which is not due to a *combination* of forces, and there is no combination of forces which is invariable, none which is not capable of change in infinite degrees. In these senses—and these are the common senses in which law is used to express the phenomena of nature—law is not rigid, it is not immutable, it is not invariable, but it is, on the contrary, pliable, subtle, various."

In summing up in the conclusion of the treatise the author charges thus gallantly down again on this stronghold of unbelief: "The superstition which saw in all natural phenomena the action of capricious deities, was not more irrational than the superstition which sees in them nothing but the action of invariable law. Men have been right and not wrong when they saw in the facts of nature the variability of adjustment even more clearly and more surely than they saw the constancy of force. They were right when they regarded the arrangements of nature as susceptible of change." It is an unspeakable comfort that when we come to close quarters with this vision of invariable law seated on the throne of nature, we find it a phantom and a dream—a mere nightmare of ill-digested thought and of God's great gift of speech abused.

Argyll is most happy in treating of "Combination and Adjustment for the Accomplishment of Purpose." He shows that Mr. Darwin, after discarding the idea that there is intention expressed in nature, yet over and over again uses that principle, and confesses that he can not succeed in attempts to interpret nature without its aid. But we call special attention to the fact that Argyll is not an advocate of an absolute teleology. He says distinctly, "Final ends we can never see." But we are no worse off in teleology than we are in causation. "We can not reach final causes any more than final purposes. For every cause which we can detect there is another cause which lies behind; and for every purpose which we see there are other purposes which lie beyond." "But a purpose is not less a purpose because other purposes may lie beyond it." We ought to remember that the principle of the relativity of knowledge covers teleology as well as other departments. It is not absolute and ultimate, but relative and proximate ends that we discover in nature. And these we do discover. "Purpose is often," says Argyll, "the only thing in natural phenomena which is intelligible to us. The 'How' is very often incomprehensible when the 'Why' is apparent at a glance." This is a complete defence against those who say that teleology is an attempt to pass judgment on the secrets of the universe by the limited measure of human faculties. It no more transcends the legitimate sphere of the human faculties to pass judgment on proximate purposes than on proximate causes.

"The Reign of Law" is another treatise in Natural Theology based on the argument from design, making use of recent discoveries in its illustration. If there be validity in that argument at all, this treatise should be highly prized, for it is one of the finest expositions of it. Theology cannot give that argument up. It is its only standing place in nature. If "this goodly frame, the earth; this most excellent canopy, the air; this brave o'erhanging firmament, this majestic roof fretted with golden fire," do not disclose the agency of mind, we may despair of being able to prove that there is any such agency at all.

Just now the argument from design seems to be somewhat under a shadow, and it is a good thing to have such a treatise as "The Reign of Law," brought before the minds of scholars, that they may see how that argument springs up with perennial vitality before every fresh aspect of nature. Before the argument is surrendered, let it be remembered that it is the one which David and Socrates, Paul and Bacon, Humboldt and Agassiz, put forth. Agassiz has recently said of Humboldt, "He had too logical a mind to assume that a harmoniously combined whole is the result of accidental occurrence."

Paley is perhaps to be charged with some responsibility for the cloud of suspicion that rests over this argument; while, having collated a mass of facts for which Theology ought ever to feel toward him a grateful sense of indebtedness, he has managed, from his facts, to state his argument in the weakest possible form, and then to give to it the strongest possible name. Thus that which often takes place has happened to the argument from design. Men have supposed the argument to be demolished because a vice has been detected in a certain method of stating it. Paley confines his attention to single instances of fitness, considering them separately, and then says that the argument is cumulative. If any one will read the sixth chapter of Paley's Natural Theology, and then read the description of a cumulative argument in Whateley's Rhetoric, he will see that Paley has not made a cumulative argument at all. The argument that above all others is brought to play in the profession of law is a species of the argument from design in the cumulative form. Whenever questions of "*quo animo*" arise, as in the construction of statutes, contracts, wills, a species of this argument is used. It runs through criminal law from beginning to end. The cases are not rare in law where the argument is used in precisely the same form in which it is sought to be used in theology. The question often occurs in law, "Were such and such events or connections of circumstances accidental, or do they show the agency of mind?" How a lawyer binds the facts of his case together, showing

arrangement after arrangement, conduced toward an end to be charged upon the mind of a certain party, we well know. No lawyer would recognize the argument as cumulative as it is stated in Paley's Sixth Chapter. Had Paley remembered what Bacon had said before him, he might have been saved his vicious method of statement. Bacon says, "While the mind of man looketh upon second causes *scattered*, it may sometimes rest in them, and go no further; but when it beholdeth the *chain* of them *confederate and linked together*, it must needs fly to Providence and Deity." It is not the single fitness of one thing to another that proves design. Such fitness may well be the result of accident. But when you have fitness after fitness tethered together, and then series of these joined, producing a result, the case is wholly different. It is not so much the *fitness* as the *chain* that needs accounting for. To confine the vision to a single case of fitness in stating the argument from design is a great fallacy. That is not the case which nature offers us.

"The Reign of Law" is a masterpiece of the cumulative argument from design. It is a whole, with that argument running through it all. But specially the chapter on "Contrivance a Necessity, as exhibited in the Machinery for the Flight of Birds," is one of the finest contributions in our literature to the argument from design in its genuine cumulative form. It is valuable, not more for what it demonstrates than for what it suggests. All nature is full of material for just such argument. And what we need is more familiarity with nature that we may better know how to use her stores.

"Little do we see in nature that is ours."

The argument will grow in force upon honest minds the wider the range it takes. And we might as well recognize, first as last, that honest minds are the only ones on whom our arguments will have any effect. Theology has been brought into disrepute by its attempts to corner and convict dishonest minds, in spite of themselves, by quirks of logic. We call for statistics showing the number of minds that have been con-

vinced of the existence of a God by the twists of logic employed by Turretin or Dr. Samuel Clarke.

There is no argument by which a man will be convinced that there is intelligence presiding over nature, except as there is exhibited to him, in department after department, adjustment after adjustment, accomplishing ends. Then it must be left to his honesty to decide whether he can account for such adjustments, except they be made under the guidance of mind. In law, in questions of "*quo animo*" that go to the jury, *they find the intent from the facts shown*. It is safe to follow that method in putting the argument from design in theology. And if material is handled as well as the Duke of Argyll has handled his, the argument will be effective, except with those who will not see.

Of course, if the position should be established in metaphysics that inquiry into purpose is a native principle of the mind, the argument assumes greater strength to those who understand metaphysics; but to the masses, the strength of the argument is and will always be as above.

A most satisfactory body of evidence for the existence of a Presiding Intelligence may be gathered under Argyll's fifth definition of law: "Law as an order of thought." There is an ideal order beneath the system of nature.

"The very possibility of exact science," says Argyll, "depends upon the fact that such an ideal order does actually prevail, and is related to the abstract conceptions of our own nature."

The Kosmos is so arranged that the human mind can strike the trail of this ideal order. Agassiz speaks of outlining possible forms of species, and afterwards finding that those forms had been filled by nature.

What is this great system of *classification* that runs through all vegetable and animal life, but an order that must have been established by mind? It makes no difference how it was brought about, whether by direct creation, or by evolution; here it is, a *system*, with its ideal order beneath it.

Let it come by evolutions if so it come; when it is here, it is stamped as a thing of thought.

Darwin's treatise on the origin of species was possible only on the ground that there is a plan beneath all life—an ideal order so distinctly executed, that he expects to be understood when he speaks of species, or varieties even.

There is a fear that the theory of evolution will lead to atheism. The fear is groundless if all the facts in the case are kept in mind. Let all so fearing read carefully what Argyll says on the subject of "Correlations of Growth." We have room for but one extract: "If, then, it be true that new species are created out of small variations in the form of old species, and this by way of natural generation, there must be some bond of connection which determines those variations in a definite direction, and keeps up the external correlations *pari passu* with the internal correlations." If one would see how true this must be, let him look at the progressive development that runs through the geologic ages. Admit that it is the power of the environment over life which gives specific form, the forces of that environment must have been kept to a definite end. Such adjustments must have been made in evoking new species as to preserve the typical idea beneath the old, and to make definite advance upon it in the direction of a higher development. For that is what has actually been executed.

But this is not all of the matter. Not only have the external conditions been held to the development of any one type to higher forms, but series of types have been evolved, the various steps the while being kept parallel with each other. A web of interdependence has been filled at the same time that the warp of development was produced. It is not a single scroll that has been unrolled, but innumerable scrolls, arranged in such a manner that at all times appropriate lines should join so as to be read across. For instance, it is quite possible that internal and external correlations should have been so directed in the vegetable world that from the simplest germs there should ultimately be elaborated a flora bearing

the richest fruits. So also in the animal world that man should be produced. The problem has been to carry along each on its separate line, and yet bring them out together. This problem has been executed. The Rosaceæ, bearing their luscious fruits, so agreeable to man, are here, together with man himself. A single fact of this kind is of great significance, because of the double line of adjustments that has been necessary to produce it. Upon the evidence of just one fact of a similar character, to wit, that the horse, and not any of his ancestors in the supposed line of derivation, Hippion or Palæotherium, is a contemporary of man, Prof. Owen concludes that "there is a Divinity that shapes our ends."

But what strength does not the argument assume when such facts can be collated indefinitely?

Here are adaptations. It is when we trace the chain of their antecedents and causes, *confederate and linked together*, that the conclusion is forced upon us in one of those "swift conceptions that outrun the deductions of logic," that they are *purposed adaptations—that they are the ends in view of a designing mind.*

The mastery of the thought in this treatise will give one a point of command over the most of the positions of the popular unbelief arising from a scientific source. The author's position is, that the system, *as it is*, affords convincing evidence that it is an adjustment of mind. Suppose, from this summit, one looks out on Darwin's position, that species are made by modifications, which are impressed upon organs by their environment. He can admit it, and yet show that this environment is so manipulated that it always brings forth an orderly system which reveals both the presence and the progress of thought.

Suppose you look at Professor Huxley's position that vital force is but an allotropic form of chemical force—that the same forces which preside over the arrangement of the atoms of a crystal, govern the arrangement of the atoms that build up a leaf. Be it so. But those forces are so guided that

various kinds of leaves are made, and various kinds of purposes are subserved by those leaves. By as much as the agencies are limited in number and simple in character, by so much the more does the conviction grow that only intelligent skill could secure the permanency of the distinctions which we see in nature, and at the same time elaborate its infinite variety of detail. Let the particles of chlorophyl and cellulose troop to their places under what laws they will, when they get into the position they express a most wonderfully varied and beautiful system of thought.

"Protoplasm," says Professor Huxley, "is the physical basis of life." It might as well be protoplasm as anything else. The simplicity of the common basis does not set aside the fact that out of it a wonderfully complete system has been reared that is eloquent throughout of the directing agency of mind.

Take Herbert Spencer's denial of an absolute beginning of the universe or of anything in it. We catch a glimpse of an old priest who was "without beginning of days or end of life," and yet when he crosses our vision he is serving at the altars of the Most High God. It is possible that it may be thus with the universe. It is possible one may not be able to show an *absolute* beginning — possible that there may not be a single thing in the system upon which we can put our finger and say, "of this there was no antecedent in the system" — possible that, could we stand at the point in time and space, where we have been accustomed to locate absolute beginnings, as the new forms or new conditions rose before us, we should see nothing that did not seem to rise by natural consequence out of existing organisms or existing forces and materials.

Yet we do have *relative* beginnings — we do have the old transformed to the new to meet new exigencies and to execute new purposes — we do have the new extending the thought beneath the old to a higher type. The pageant of the Kosmos, as it rolls up to our vision from eternity and passes before us, reveals to us nothing if it do not show that its order is the methodical adjustment of thought. It is perhaps of no

more importance to show an absolute beginning in time, than it is to show an absolute limit in space. The latter certainly can not be done.

If we find proof of an intelligent purpose in adjustments contained in the sections of time and space over which we can push our investigations, that is enough. Argyll's criticism upon Darwin is perhaps in the main sound. But it should be borne in mind that the force of the criticism is not spent against the idea of the derivation (as Owen would say) of one species from another, but against the position that what Darwin calls the principle of Natural Selection, is the sole and sufficient cause of those variations which give rise to new species. The origin of species by Derivation may be a fact, but Natural Selection inadequate to introduce it.

But whatever the forces may be that are called into play in the differentiation of species, they are held to the accomplishment of definite ends. It is quite possible, nay, probable, that instead of the die that holds the type being broken every time a new species is to be introduced, it is simply recut in some of its parts, genetic connection being preserved.

This treatise can be recommended as likely to suggest to theologians proper methods of dealing with science. It may suggest that what passes current as scientific atheism is allowed so to pass because it is not moulded to Theism — that very much that is regarded as dangerous, might not only be harmless, but serviceable, if it were only put in proper position in some comprehensive system. It would be exceedingly strange if the marvelous progress that has recently been made in scientific study should not necessitate a revision of our grounds in Natural Theology. It is an excellent habit of mind to be always trying to see how much can be made for Theism and Religion out of new scientific theories, before putting one's self in antagonism to them.

It is not often that the theologian needs to assume the burden of proof in establishing a correct science. He does not need to keep up a running fusillade of denial of alleged scientific fact or theory even. He ought to import from the law

more of the principle of the demurrer, and less of the general issue—to say oftener, “Well, what of it?” and less frequently, “No, it is not so.” It might appear as often as otherwise to one so doing that he could make as much out of scientific theories as skeptics can. For instance, to one who has thought sufficiently upon it, there ought to be some very welcome and agreeable views connected with the theory of evolution. On that theory one can put God in present connection with, and supervisor over, his works better than any other.

The old conception was, that ages ago the universe was projected ready made, and then and there put into gear and set to running. The theory of evolution gives the conception that the universe, as much now as ever, is in the process of making.

It is quite as hard to find a God *behind* the system, according to the old idea, as to detect him in the *present working* of the system according to the new. “My Father is working up to this time,” says the Saviour, and we may make that the radical idea beneath the theory of evolution. The old notion supposed breaks in the Divine activity. According to that we said “Here and now, second causes—then and there, God.” Under the theory of evolution we can say if we will, “Then, and now, and everywhere, God—God in the ordinary as well as in the extraordinary.”

Sermons are often preached in which it is assumed to be of the last importance to defend the position that there can be no possible link of connection between the ape and man. And the impression is left, that if such connection should be established, Christian Theism would be overthrown.

The author of this article stood, a year ago, in the Academy of Sciences in Philadelphia, before the skeletons of an ape and a man placed side by side. It seemed to him that it was a misdirection of energy for a Christian theist to be tenacious in maintaining that there could be no bridge in nature which could span that slight structural difference. He felt a disinclination to deploy his forces on such an issue. It seemed better to claim that the bridge had been passed, somehow,

no matter how, by genetic connection, if science would have it so, but passed, passed for a purpose, passed to execute a new and higher idea. On such an issue there could be put in evidence, instead of the simple structural difference that separated the man and the ape anatomically, the new purpose which man was to serve in the economy of the world, no matter where he came from. That man was not *now* an ape, there could be put in evidence, against the blankness of the ape's record, the Pennsylvania Central Railroad, Independence Hall with its history and suggestions, and, more conclusive perhaps than all else, the very institution in which those skeletons hung, with its almost countless specimens scientifically arranged, demonstrating that there is plan in nature, and that the mind of man can detect that plan. *How* man came here seemed a matter of indifference, but that he *was here*, as the crowning fact in a *plan* in which all along the ages he had been foreshadowed, seemed a conclusion irresistible.

The Secretary of the American Board for the Northwest, utters his clarion call for young men to go to the front in Foreign Missions. Let the call be heeded. But there is another front to which men must be summoned if we would hold the thinking mind of our own country, and that is, that border line of philosophy that lies between Science and Religion. The Christian church is in as much need of enthusiasm here as on any other field. The cause of Christ is compromised by the crudities exhibited by many of its champions in their criticisms upon science, and compromised still more perhaps by their ruffled bearing.

But to put one on the right track as to matter, method and spirit, there is nothing superior to the Duke of Argyll's "*Reign of Law*." While there are sentences and positions that challenge adverse criticism, the book, as a whole, is to be "*read, marked, learned and inwardly digested*." In style it is a "*well of English undefiled*." The march of its thought over the field is often as thrilling and grand as the sweep of "*an army with banners*."

## ARTICLE V.

## MODERN EVANGELISTS.

Two principal questions arise in the discussion of this subject. 1. Is such an order of men as modern evangelists of divine appointment? 2. If no sufficient authority is found for them in the New Testament, is such an order *desirable* as a regular (or irregular) instrumentality among the churches?

The result of our investigation of the first question may be given very briefly. According to Conybeare and Howson, "The term evangelist seems to have been almost synonymous with our word missionary." "It is applied," say these writers, "to those missionaries who, like Philip and Timothy, traveled from place to place to bear the glad tidings of Christ to unbelieving nations or individuals."\* Neander attaches the same meaning to the word, calling them "missionaries or evangelists." "The term could only denote," he adds, "one whose calling it was to *publish* the doctrine of salvation to men, and thereby to lay a foundation for the Christian church." Whereas, the pastor, or teacher, "presupposed faith in the doctrine of salvation, and a church already founded, and employed himself in the further training of the church in Christian knowledge."†

One of our theological professors states the case succinctly thus: "The office of an evangelist, in the modern acceptation of the term, is not known to the primitive and apostolic churches either in name or theory. Calvin, John Cotton, Davidson, Ellicott, and the best authorities generally, regard the office as in its nature temporary, and ceasing when the apostolic office ceased."‡

\* *Life and Epistles of St. Paul* (People's ed.), pp. 381, 615.

† *Planting and Training of the Christian Church*, B. III. ch. v.

‡ Article on "The Modern Evangelist," in *The Advance*, March 12, 1868.

The evangelists did, occasionally, revisit the churches which they had planted to inspect and strengthen them; but those churches were not generally supplied with pastors whose very business it was to watch over and defend the flock of God. They were, rather, as sheep without a shepherd; and Paul and Silas were doing strictly missionary work, when they went through Syria and Cilicia confirming the churches." (Acts xv: 41).

In the original import of the word, as denoting those who *publish* the glad tidings of salvation to the ignorant and destitute, there can be no doubt that evangelists, or missionaries, are an authorized and a very important class of Christian laborers, to be maintained and multiplied beyond all present supply, till the gospel shall be preached among all nations "for obedience to the faith." But in its modern and popular acceptation, as designating a class of ministers who move about among the churches and labor in connection with pastors and teachers to promote revivals, it evidently has no authority from the scriptural term *evangelist*. If there is any for it in the principles or usages of the early churches, or in the constitutions and wants of our modern organizations, that can be shown, and is legitimate authority, so far as it goes; but we have failed to find any such authority.

Our inquiry, therefore, in this article, pertains chiefly to the wisdom, the utility, the expediency of employing such a class of men for the promotion of Christianity.

On this question there seems to be some diversity of opinion; and it is well to look carefully to the merits of the case as learned from facts and from philosophy.

In the first place, we do not deny, nor doubt, that good results have sometimes followed the labors of modern evangelists—or revivalists—as they may with more accuracy and propriety be called.\* They are generally good men, trying to do good; and those who encourage them are good men also, and striving to do good. They have, usually, some

\* "Revivalist: a clergyman without a particular charge, who goes about to promote revivals. (Recent.)"—Webster.

special adaptedness to interest and wake up the people, both Christians and the unconverted. Their personal traits and their peculiar methods are calculated to enlist the attention and awaken the interest, especially of those of an impressible nature ; and when joined with a devout and prayerful spirit, and extra meetings and measures, often result in the quickened activity of church members, and the hopeful conversion of sinners to Christ. The labors of such men as Whitefield, Wesley, Nettleton, Finney, and others, have doubtless been the means of bringing many to repentance and newness of life. Wesley and Whitefield, however, come more properly under the head of evangelists of the old type—preaching the gospel to the neglected and destitute—field-preachers in waste places—real missionaries, and not mere auxiliaries to settled pastors.

But, are there no drawbacks in the case ? Has there been no counter influence arising from these later evangelistic labors ? Might not this extra labor have been bestowed on some other field, where there was no culture, without any unfavorable influence ? The mere fact that one has wrought good in a certain place, does not prove that he could not have wrought as much, and even more, in some other place. The mere fact that one has been converted by a certain instrumentality, does not prove that he could not have been converted, quite as soundly, by some other instrumentality. A distinguished professor of theology used to say that a sinner *might* be converted at too great expense. That is, when measures were adopted that would hinder the conversion of others. And if one, then a larger number—especially if at the expense of putting the common means of grace and the stated ministry to dishonor.

Suppose our evangelists—if they prefer the word—had, in strict accordance with the primitive order, declined to labor with old and strong churches, already supplied with faithful pastors, and had said to such churches and pastors, “ No ; you do not need us, nor deserve any more help ; work yourselves for a higher life, and for the conversion of sinners, and send us to

the gentiles, or to those who have none to break unto them the bread of life." And suppose those churches had done so, in the name of the Master, and, in obedience to his command, "*Go ye and disciple all nations,*" who can doubt that God would have blessed them, and added to them many such as should be saved; while, at the same time, the evangelists would also have received blessings and gathered fruit unto eternal life in other fields.

The real alternative, then, is not whether we shall employ these men in the established churches already supplied with faithful pastors or lose them altogether; nor is it whether we shall have revivals through the instrumentality of evangelists or not at all; but, whether those men shall bestow labor upon fields already under good cultivation, or upon fields that are white to harvest, with no one to enter and thrust in the sickle; and, whether the churches shall be enlarged and built up by their own and the pastor's faithful labors, with the blessing of God, or by the extra labors of those who might be, and probably should be, going forth, after the example of Christ, to seek and to save the lost sheep, who are without any shepherd to lead them.

Looking at the subject in this most favorable light, does it not admit of candid doubt whether the labors of evangelists might not be more wisely and effectively bestowed upon the destitute fields, stretching away on every side to an indefinite extent, than upon fields already supplied with "pastors and teachers," after the pattern prescribed by the Master himself?

But this is not the only aspect of the case that needs to be considered. If it must be conceded that there are advantages in this concentrated method of labor in certain fields, it must also be admitted that there are serious disadvantages, and even positive evils growing out of it. We express the conviction deliberately and mournfully, that the extraordinary appliances and pressure almost invariably used on such occasions, tend to disturb and undermine, more than to promote, the stated work of the pastor. Not in every case; not on the first survey; but in many cases, and on a thorough examina-

tion of indirect and oblique influences and results, which are so easily and so generally overlooked in the published accounts of evangelistic labors. They do this in two ways:

1. By developing and encouraging a hasty and superficial piety.

2. By awakening in the minds of many, both in the church and out of it, a distrust of the ordinary and stated preaching of the gospel.

It has fallen to the lot of the writer to labor, more than once, in fields that had been subjected to this peculiar treatment; to encounter in his work the direct results and the indirect influences of the peculiar views and measures adopted in the prosecution of evangelistic labors. He may have been unfortunate in this respect; probably has been. He has, therefore, endeavored to look beyond his own unhappy experience to find the philosophy involved in the subject, as derived from a wider sphere and more favorable experiences.

The testimony of different witnesses is often conflicting as to the permanent results of special evangelistic labors. Rev. Dr. Stone, of San Francisco, e. g., speaks favorably of the result of Mr. \_\_\_\_\_'s labors in that city three years ago. While Dr. Sawtelle, a Baptist minister of the same place, says, in the *Spare Hour*, that "the greater part of the reputed converts proved to be spurious and went back. The work, even in those hearts in which it was genuine, was in most cases superficial. Convictions, whether of personal sin, or of divine acceptance, were generally without much pungency or power. *Social sympathy appeared to be a greater instrument in carrying on the work than the naked, sovereign doctrine of the gospel.* There were some genuine conversions; but it is the common testimony of our ministers, in reviewing that work, that in most instances "the hurt of the daughter of my people was healed but slightly." \*

\* Dr. Sawtelle adds in a private note: "I understand my article was referred to in the weekly Presbyterian meeting of this city with substantial approval. The Baptists generally are with me in my statement. The Petaluma pastors and members say it might have gone further, with truth. Probably there was a difference in the results in different places. But even the most favorable believers in the work will say there was great exaggeration of the fruits."

What are some of the special measures employed by the modern evangelists generally? These among others: extra and prolonged meetings—sometimes authoritatively requiring, as a condition precedent, the union, real or feigned, of all the churches of a town, and the suspension of business during the meetings; laying great stress upon special methods, as rising, or coming forward for prayers without any due discrimination of the real wants of the people in that respect, pressing what should be left entirely to personal choice into a regular and essential step in the process of conversion, etc. These means are made so prominent that they often become more important, and elicit more observation and remark among the people, than the preaching of the word, which was the great instrumentality used by the apostles, by the primitive evangelists, and by the earlier modern evangelists—Wesley, Whitefield, and others—and which must still be the great instrumentality of the ordinary ministers of Christ. These special methods seem to be so effective, as used by the evangelist, that the impression is received by the indiscriminating, if not intentionally conveyed by the evangelist, that without these measures, there is little to be expected, however ably and faithfully the gospel may be preached. In consequence of the great importance attached to them, they are often complied with as a substitute for true repentance and turning to God. Under the false impression that the great thing is accomplished when one has publicly *committed* himself, (as it is called), the real life-work of religion is underestimated, and a superficial or false piety is accepted in its place.

The regular pastor cannot properly or profitably use these methods in his ordinary ministrations. And so it comes to be expected, by many, that no conversions will take place under the ordinary means of grace; and no real effort is made for such a result; but the demand is for an extra laborer, of whom they hear and read such wonderful things.

Now, it is perfectly natural that the minds of the people should be moved by such reports, and that they should attach great importance to such instrumentality, especially since so

much is attached to it by the leaders of the flock, and that they should desire to see and feel its stimulating power themselves. And when they do get this notion fixed in their minds, it is just as natural that they should become restless and dissatisfied under the ordinary methods of labor. "If this plan is generally adopted (to quote again from the article in *The Advance*), the churches and pastors will naturally come to expect an awakening of religious interest only in connection with such special and extra labors. And in proportion as they cease to expect, they will cease to labor for it. They will say, or if they do not say it, the tacit feeling will be, "it is of no use to take any measures for a revival now; wait till Mr. ——, or Mr. ——, the distinguished revivalist, comes along. He never fails." In proportion as this feeling prevails, another result will follow equally disastrous: the churches will come to undervalue the regular labors and the legitimate office of the Christian pastor. It is almost impossible it should be otherwise. As compared with the more important work of the evangelist, his labors will seem to be of small account. Whatevér tends to produce this impression, and leads men to undervalue, in any degree, the regular pastoral office, tends not to the welfare, but to the serious detriment of the church and cause of Christ.

In a fair and comprehensive estimate of the subject, therefore, we must take into account this refluent wave of influence which chills and disturbs those pastors who are unable, or indisposed, to obtain such help, whether from lack of sufficient supply, or from deliberate conviction that that is not the true way, according to the plan of the Master.\*

Moreover, churches and ministers who adopt this instrumentality, become dependent upon it for all forward movements, even after they are numerically, and ought to be

\* The writer remembers, very distinctly — as almost any minister would be likely to in similar circumstances — the serious proposition of one of his members, in a church meeting, without any previous consultation with the pastor, to send for two extra laborers — one to preach, and the other to visit and labor privately — without any recognition of work for him or the members to do.

experimentally, strong, without any such help. We have in mind a large church in one of the Middle States which has rejoiced in repeated and extensive revivals, whose pastor had often engaged in evangelistic work, but which still continues to call for a *revivalist* to secure the desired result, just as much, and even more, than before it was enforced by such remarkable ingatherings; and more than those churches which have never received such aid.

A little church in the State of Vermont deserves to be named, in this connection, as illustrating the difference between a church which systematically depends upon foreign labor, and one that puts its trust in the Lord, and goes forth prayerfully and expectantly, bearing precious seed, and returns in due season bringing its golden sheaves. "The work in B., Vt.," says the *Congregationalist*, "has been, and still is, among young men and men in middle life. Most of the business men of the place are now working Christians. The interest has also included several persons over fifty years of age, four of whom are above sixty. *The church, being a working church, has had no aid from abroad.* On Wednesday evening four meetings are held, in different parts of the town." Another notice, several weeks later, adds, "The church in B. received, at the last communion, forty-seven new members, as first fruits of the revival there. *The interest still continues.*" As we should expect it would, under such circumstances.

We can not forbear to say, in passing, that this is very nearly our ideal of a true church of Christ—"a working church"—and that the encouragement and development of such churches ought to be our great aim and endeavor, in all our ministerial work.

Suppose these heroic Benson brethren—"young men and men in middle life"—proceeded on the plan of the great church in ——, one of the Middle States, and had said among themselves, "It is of no use for us to go to work here by ourselves, with only the Lord and the truth on our side, let us go down to Egypt, or somewhere else, and call a modern

evangelist to our aid." Possibly they might have found one; but probably not. If they had, they would very likely have prevented him from going to the aforesaid feeble church in \_\_\_\_\_, one of the Middle States; and then it would have been left destitute, and, in all probability, would have had no revival.

As showing to what extent the people are becoming accustomed to measure the progress of religion in a place by the special means employed, and the special results obtained, the following instances may be given: The *B— Republic* states that "the revival at the M. E. church, in that place, closed Tuesday evening, February 8, after a successful continuance of nearly six weeks. About forty persons, during the time, solicited the prayers of the church, and twenty-seven united with the M. E. church. The work continued with unabated zeal up to the close of the meeting." A *revival* cut square off, "on Tuesday evening, February 8," probably at about ten o'clock, "after a successful continuance of nearly six weeks!" As, however, it seems to have consisted largely in soliciting the prayers of the church, instead of repenting and believing in the Lord Jesus Christ, perhaps it is not wonderful that it closed somewhat abruptly.

"But *that* was from a secular, country journal, that did not know any better than to speak so." Very well; *this* is from a *religious* journal, published in a *city*, which *should* have known better, at least: "The Congregational and Methodist churches in H\_\_\_\_\_, Michigan, *have just closed a deeply interesting revival*, in which they have been largely blessed, and a goodly number converted." We should think that those Congregational and Methodist brethren might have been better employed than in bringing such a work as that to a close!

A recent notice spoke of a *revival*, somewhere, "under the direction of Mrs. \_\_\_\_\_." Possibly there was more of truth in the statement than the writer was aware of.

These are specimens of what may be seen every week, both in secular and religious journals.

Still further to illustrate the growing indispensableness of this modern evangelistic agency, to those who rely upon and encourage it, take the case (recently reported in *The Advance*) of a church, strong in numbers and intelligence, with a regular pastor, and several able and experienced ministers resident in the town — already enjoying a good state of revival influence — sending away for Mr. ——, an eminent revivalist, to crowd the work along. As if three or four ministers on the ground, with the help of the Spirit of the Lord and a praying church, were not enough to accomplish the work, without the aid of a modern evangelist.

But, it is claimed, as a matter of fact, that the labors of these men are very successful, much more so than those of the stated ministry, and that a large proportion of those now in the churches were brought in through the agency of evangelists.

We reply: (a.) Admitting the fact, it proves nothing as to the genuineness of Christian character. Many are in the churches who do not belong there. A Methodist minister of our acquaintance, by authority of the official board, recently struck off sixty names, at one time, from the church records; not from the probationary list, but of those that had fallen away from full membership. The Methodist church is not the only one that would be benefitted by a similar process of pruning.

(b.) The very prominence given to the agency (as we have before shown), has undoubtedly contributed not a little to the depression and unfruitfulness of the ordinary ministrations of the gospel.

(c.) We deny the claim of such wonderful and extensive results of evangelistic labor. Much of the fruit, and the best of it, gathered by these men, and reported so conspicuously in the papers, is attributable chiefly to the careful husbandry of the regular pastor, and was, perhaps, just ready to be gathered in when the evangelist came along and shook it from the tree where it had been ripening for months or years — claiming all the honor to himself, or others claiming it for him. It is time

that a more careful discrimination of influences and results, in this work, should be exercised and promulgated. Let us no more charge all the dullness and barrenness in spiritual life to the poor pastor, who has toiled all the night and taken nothing; nor ascribe all the life and fruit to the temporary evangelist, who often only plucks the fruit which has been reared by others.

Moreover, two very remarkable matters of fact stand over against this claim in behalf of evangelists, viz., that we fail to find any provision for this instrumentality in the New Testament, or in our modern system of theological training for the ministry. How happens it that one of the most efficient instrumentalities for the conversion of men, and the furtherance of the kingdom of Christ, should be left out of the plan by the Master, and by the wisest and best of his ministers and members? We make provision for "pastors and teachers," for missionaries to the heathen and to the destitute portions of our own land, but none for modern evangelists. *They* spring up spontaneously, and drop down here and there among the churches, doing wonderful works, and getting great approbation for their skill and success in winning souls. It is a little singular, surely, that so important an agency should have been thus overlooked by the highest authorities. Or, is it, in its very nature, anomalous, and to be left to regulate and take care of itself? This will hardly be claimed while we use our wisdom in reference to every other agency which comes within our responsibility.

It must follow, then, if the agency is really so important and so useful as it is claimed to be, that there has been a wonderful oversight, up to the present hour, in not seeking to develop it, and to provide it for the churches generally throughout the land. We cannot recall a single instance in which one of our principal denominations or theological seminaries has made any direct provision of the kind. We have, indeed, a faint reminiscence of a proposition being once made to Mr. Nettleton to go to a certain high place and initiate a prominent preacher into the mysteries of his remarkable success in win-

ning souls. But the proposition was met with a frown, as if it were almost blasphemous, like the proposal of Simon Magus to purchase the gift of God. Why should it have been so regarded any more than the effort to train men to be skillful pastors and teachers? If this instrumentality is so potent for good, why should it not be more generally provided, to meet the demands of all the churches? There are scarcely half a dozen accepted and skillful revivalists in our whole denomination to meet the wants of thousands of churches east and west, north and south, to supplement the successful "toiling in rowing" of thousands of ministers, who really need help as much, and perhaps more, than those that receive it, and who are, some of them at least, questioning earnestly why those who are already strong, and numerous, and prosperous, should be thus favored, and others be left to toil on in weariness and painfulness, sowing much, and reaping little.

If the Spirit of God is really with those revivalists, in some special manner, and in extraordinary measure—as would seem to be the case, judging from the accounts in the papers and elsewhere of the out-pourings of the Holy Spirit on their labors, and the special presence of God in their meetings—there should surely be no replying against God. But is it not too readily and too commonly assumed that such is the case; that the remarkable results of the measures of these men are to be ascribed to the Spirit of God specially poured out upon their efforts; that the Holy Spirit is fitful and fluctuating with our fluctuating moods and efforts, instead of the calm, still, constant power which the gospel proclaims? Do we make proper allowance for special *human* influences—social sympathy, personal magnetism, etc.—in producing these results? A casual remark, dropped by one, concerning a prominent evangelist, “he is a man of *great magnetic* as well as spiritual power,” suggests a point which needs to be more carefully considered than it has been—one to which, in no small measure, these remarkable results are to be attributed. We do not say that such influences are necessarily mischievous. They are often instrumentally useful, and, to a certain extent, are

unavoidable. But they are human, not divine, and should not be ascribed to the special agency of God's Spirit.

If, then, there is something peculiarly impressive in the method and manner of these men, aside from any special influence of the Spirit of God, which results in bringing men to Christ, why may not this something be communicated to others, or developed in others, in larger numbers—even to regular ministers in their ordinary work? And why is it not a legitimate part of the work of professors of divinity and trainers of ministers, in all our schools of theology, to *find out* and *impart*, to our young men especially, the secret, or the philosophy, of their remarkable success? If this is the one conspicuous way of advancing the kingdom of Christ, as it would seem to be, from the reports of revivals, which frequently make mention of no other agency but that of the evangelist—if this is the divinely approved and accepted medium of communicating the special influences of the Holy Spirit, and reaching effectively the hearts and wills of unconverted men—then, most assuredly, all high and benevolent motives should impel us to pray and labor with importunity that God would endow many more of his ministers with like power and wisdom, or send forth many more special laborers into his harvest. It is not “pastors and teachers,” according to this system, that are most needed for the revival and propagation of religion (as our present plan assumes), but more modern evangelists. These are the laborers that are so “few and far between” in our churches, and that are so pre-eminently successful in winning souls. They are the ones, therefore, that need to be increased and multiplied, till all the plodding and unskillful workmen now in charge of the churches shall be supplemented and made joyful by the power and grace of God resting upon their famishing flocks.

The appeal in *The Advance*, a few months ago, by “a Chicago layman,” entitled “Trained Evangelists Wanted,” was a legitimate appeal, growing out of the custom of employing such men in connection with the stated ministry. “Since I have been on this coast,” he writes from San Francisco, “I

have been strengthened in the views I had long entertained, that the church ought to encourage evangelists, to *train* them for that work, and set them apart for it, with its sanctioned authority." Most assuredly so. The inference is entirely pertinent and logical. If the practice of resorting to evangelists to secure revivals and religious progress is right and wise, that inference can not be wrong.

This is not mere cavilling, as some may be disposed to regard it, nor "the violence of direction," as Mr. Emerson speaks, which disqualifies one to think truly, but legitimate and fair argument, which deserves fair and deliberate consideration.

We must, in conclusion, state, very briefly, what seems to us the true method of spiritual life and labor—the highest vantage ground, to be sought after and built upon, in the great work of evangelizing the world and building up the kingdom of Christ.

We believe in revivals of religion. Wise, patient, faithful labor for the furtherance of the gospel and the salvation of men, will result, with the blessing of God, in the quickening of Christians and the awakening of sinners. All such efforts, put forth for the permanent elevation and progress of religion, are to be encouraged, and hailed with gladness and thanksgiving.

But, working for a revival, as such, as an end in itself, is almost sure to be followed by a corresponding depression and backsliding, which is a great evil.

It will be readily conceded that the system of revivals *and depressions* in religion contains an element of weakness and imperfection in its essential idea. While it may be accordant with human life in other respects, it certainly is not accordant with the highest and best state, nor with the spiritual and unchanging nature of God, of our relation to Him, and the eternal verities of His kingdom. One great objection to the modern evangelistic measures is, that they tend to give undue importance and prominence to a temporary interest, which can not be perpetuated, and is sure to be followed by a relapse.

In the highest and best state of being there will be uniform and supreme devotion to God and truth. Hence all our systems and methods should aim at this, and tend to produce this. And, in thus aiming and working, as God works, and as all holy beings work, we are confidently to expect the divine favor and help in rich and refreshing measures. "Patient continuance in well-doing," is what needs to be urged, with special emphasis, upon the churches and ministers of Christ at the present day. As a revival measure, we can think of none that would be more pertinent and hopeful.

The immediate result might not be so manifest and imposing as under the more stimulating method of culture. The present, or the next year, might not report so many inquirers or conversions, but the next ten years, and the next hundred years, might, and doubtless would, under this old and scriptural *régime*, present a grand total of "living epistles," vastly larger than under the modern system, while there would be no such horrid spectacle of backsliders and apostates as now blacken the parallel pages of our church records.

It might not be easy to bring ourselves or our churches up to this high plane of walking with God and being filled with the Spirit. No good or great work is *easy*. It should not be our inquiry, what is easy or pleasing to us, in our imperfect state, but what is right and pleasing to God, with the prompt response, thus will we do, and the Lord do what seemeth him good. "Thus saith the Lord, in returning and rest shall ye be saved." That is, in returning from *their* ways to *His* ways, confiding in Him, not in themselves, and an arm of flesh. But "they would not." They preferred their own ways and methods. And so it may continue to be in this matter. But the truth will stand.

The "Chicago Layman," who pleads so earnestly for "trained evangelists," told a story to which we would attach a very different moral from the one he gave. "Every where I meet brethren who are hungering after better things. They are praying for showers, and only drought comes. Few come to the sanctuary; very few to the weekly meeting. The

membership is dull and cold, and the minister feels so. The only live thing is the Sunday School, and that is made interesting more by the lack of spiritual power than by its presence. So things move on, year after year, until the ministers get discouraged, and the people get dissatisfied, frequent changes occur, and organizations sometimes are disbanded."

Why does only drought come in answer to their prayers? Why do their efforts prove abortive, and few come to the sanctuary, very few to the weekly meeting? Why is the membership dull and cold, year after year, till the minister gets discouraged, and the people dissatisfied? Mark well his answer: "Not because the ministers are not laborious, talented, earnest men," for "most of them are anxious to serve the Master," honest souls, if they only knew how! but—now we have it—"they lack that wisdom which an experienced evangelist gets in dealing with souls, that delicacy of touch in spiritual things, and that knowledge of human nature, which enables him to apply the truths with pertinency and power to the conscience, and bring men to immediate submission. *Many of them doubt the propriety of certain measures, and many could not adopt them gracefully, or with advantage, if approved.*" What measures, we are prompted to ask, had the apostles and the early evangelists which "could not be adopted gracefully or with advantage, if approved," by ordinary ministers of the gospel?

And his *remedy* for the evil is, not to enlighten and improve the regular ministry in "delicacy of touch," and wisdom in spiritual things, and the knowledge of human nature, whereby they might become wise to win souls, but "a trained ministry of (modern) evangelists, approved and commissioned, alert and available, at all times, minute-men for any emergency."

On the other hand, *our* moral, or inference, would be, that the deplorably lax and discouraging state of things described is due, in no small measure, to the withdrawal of confidence from the stated ministry of the word, and putting it in these extra men and measures, stimulating and forcing things for a

season, only to relapse, in a short time, into a state "worse than the first."

And our *remedy* would be, *not* the raising up of "alert and available evangelists," but to return to the good old way of the apostles and primitive disciples of Wesley, Whitefield, Edwards and McCheyne, preaching the word in demonstration of the Spirit, leaving it to grapple with the heart and conscience in its own simplicity and power, with as few altars, or anxious seats, or any other intermediate steps, as those early preachers and disciples employed.\* "For the preaching of the cross is to them that perish foolishness; but unto them who are called, both Jews and Greeks, Christ the power of God, and the wisdom of God." (1 Cor. i: 18, 24.) "Therefore, my beloved brethren, be ye steadfast, unmoveable, always abounding in the work of the Lord, forasmuch as ye know that your labor is not in vain in the Lord." (1 Cor. xv: 58.)

There are, happily, conspicuous examples to which we might refer, as confirmations of the Scripture, and of the position taken in this article. But want of space forbids further detail.

In one of his Lecture-Room Talks, Henry Ward Beecher said, "I am particularly glad, not that so many (ninety-eight) are gathered in at this time, but that it is almost the normal state of things among us, from year to year. No one rejoices more than I in the out-pouring showers that sometimes burst over a church. But every farmer knows that it is the quiet, gentle rain that does most good. And a state of feeling that will ripen fruit every week and every month is most desirable. There should never be a communion, and never a month, or a week, but that some should be brought into a state of desire, or out into a state of decision. We should have no summer, no winter, no seasons, but a perpetual *now*."

It is not the mountains alone, however sublime, that make the world, or the most valuable part of it. The intervening

\* We took up recently Watson's Life of John Wesley, expecting to find something about an *altar* on every other page, at least, and were surprised to find no mention of altar, or any other machinery for bringing men to Christ, except the earnest preaching of the word and prayer.

plains, which seem so monotonous and uninteresting, are the theatre of the grandest growths of all pleasant and useful things. The rushing wind and storm that fill us with dismay, and that have their legitimate uses, are not the only nor the main agency in fructifying the earth and cheering the hearts of the sons of men. The gentle dews that distil their moisture in silence and darkness, the light and warmth of the sun, which recur with daily regularity, imparting their benign influences to every humble nook and sandy knoll, as well as to the cultivated fields, are of no less consequence, surely, than the more noisy and turbulent elements. Let us not think that, in the spiritual kingdom, God works only, or chiefly, by outward and visible signs, in ways of human device and observation, but also, and much more, in secret, and through the common instrumentalities of truth and goodness; so that His word never returns to Him void, but something of truth, whether for gain or loss, always connects itself and remains with him who has heard it. "And all which depends on us is, that the vessel has no leak through which the living water may escape, and no impurity by which it may be corrupted. The rest belongs not to us; and so much the less does it belong to us, the more we imagine that it does."\*

\* Vinet's *Pastoral Theology*, p. 193.

## THE BOOK TABLE.

L.—ROMA SOTTERRANEA, or some Account of the Roman Catacombs; compiled chiefly from the works of Commendatore De Rossi. By J. SPENCER NORTHCOTE, D.D., and Rev. W. R. BROWNLOW, M.A. London: Longmans, Green, Reader & Dyer. 1869. Pp. 414. 8vo. (Twenty colored plates, fifty-five wood cuts, and a map.)

Fresh interest is gathering around the Roman Catacombs—those places of worship, of concealment and of burial to the early saints, afterwards of pious pilgrimage, and now of Christian archaeology. The elegant and costly volume of Northcote and Brownlow is founded chiefly on the still more costly volumes of the most recent explorer, De Rossi (1864 and 1867) systematized, condensed, and, so far as practicable, supplemented from other sources. It was commended to us as an authority on the subject; but we find that the commendation must be received with large allowances. One of the compilers is a Roman Catholic, the other an Episcopal, clergyman.

We should have been glad to balance the Episcopalian with a Congregationalist, and the Roman Catholic with a thorough iconoclast, the more rigidly to sift the conclusions. Still, these men are the enthusiasts for the work, and let us thank them for what we gain. We find ourselves, indeed, in an unexpectedly large society of early "popes," *from Peter onward*, and in an atmosphere of tradition slightly stived; and in one foot note (p. 245) we take our historic bearings from the *fourteenth* chapter of Daniel. We often question whether there is not a cerulean hue in our glasses as we look at so-called facts. Once, in the dim, religious light of 1599, we stumble upon the dead body of St. Cecilia, preserved "perfectly incorrupt" for thirteen hundred years, though the coffin had been opened eight hundred years before! Dr. Northcote actually asks us to accept this "special miracle" (p. 156) on the testimony of Pope Clement's agent (Cardinal Baronius, of Bosio), the sculptor Maderna, and "all Rome," that "came to satisfy its curiosity and devotion [!] for the space of four or five weeks." We seem to smell the blood of St. Januarius, still liquefied by a more "special miracle," after fifteen centuries, on the testimony of countless pious priests and all Naples. But let us winnow the grain from the chaff.

The vast labyrinth of galleries, called the Roman Catacombs, are cut in the rock beneath the high ground *outside* of the old city walls, and usually inside of the third milestone from the city. The passages are excavated on different levels, three, four, or even five, one above another, crossing and recrossing each of these levels, with a very considerable regularity.

If extended in a right line they would reach at least 350 miles, or the whole length of Italy. (Their extent has been estimated as high as 900 miles.) It was formerly assumed that these passages were occasioned simply by quarrying for building materials for the Eternal City; and they have been identified with the *arenariae* or sand-pits. The use of them by Christians was supposed to be an after thought. But it seems now proved that not only were they used exclusively by the Christians as places of burial and of religious assembly, but that *they were originally designed for this purpose and no other*. The plan of an *arenaria* and that of a catacomb show even to the eye an essential difference, in the greater width of the passages of one, and the greater regularity of the other. The galleries of the catacombs are from two to four feet wide, varying in height from five to twelve or fourteen feet, according to the nature of the rock. The walls on both sides are pierced with horizontal niches, like the berths of a steamer, sometimes four or five, or even six, one above the other—each of which once contained one or more dead bodies. The cell was closed by tiles or marble slabs, with cement, and rude inscriptions were scratched outside, sometimes with the trowel. These niches are occasionally interrupted by a door opening into a lateral chamber, also containing tombs, frequently of a more elaborate kind; and sometimes two, three or even four chambers were made close together, all receiving light and ventilation through one shaft or air-hole pierced upward to the open air. In this way as many as a hundred persons might be collected in some parts of the catacombs to engage in worship. Chairs for the presiding officers, and benches for the faithful may still be seen, cut in the rock.

The evidence that these excavations were originally made by Christians for their own uses, is drawn partly from historic testimonies, and largely from careful inspection. The very few Pagan inscriptions found in them are shown, with probability, to have been brought from other places, the Christians having appropriated the stones on which they were written. The few historical allusions to *arenariae*, are explained as exceptional cases, in which the Catacombs actually entered and included a portion of an *arenaria*.

The Romans, in the later days of the Republic, commonly burned their dead. But the Christians condemned the custom, and buried their dead as Christ was buried—Merivale, to the contrary, notwithstanding. Accordingly, in compliance with the law which forbade interment within the precincts of the city, they began their cemeteries without, on different sides of the city, and extended them as occasion required, not at all foreseeing the enormous extent their work would attain, nor all the uses it would serve. In process of time the excavations were indefinitely enlarged, until, it has been supposed, some millions of persons were buried there. A single crypt in the catacomb of St. Callixtus, for example, though comprised within an area of 180 feet by 100, and not especially crowded, is estimated by De Rossi to have contained two thousand persons. For it must be remembered that these places were in use for several hundred years.

For a long time there was nothing to prevent the open interment of the Christian dead in these regions. The Roman law protected burial places, and gave them a religious character. Even the bodies of those who had forfeited their lives to the law were delivered up for burial. The earlier Christian martyrs were not excepted, and it was not till the year 203 A.D. that Christian cemeteries were practically excluded from the general protection of the law. Indeed, the first general edict by which the Roman Catacombs were affected, was that of Valerian (A.D. 257), and was aimed at their use as places of worship, or of secret assembly.

The origin of these cemeteries presents nothing extraordinary. The Christians used their liberty and followed their custom. Their use of these excavations as burial places is alleged to have begun in apostolic times, and continued, with a brief interval, after Constantine's conversion, till the capture of the city by Alaric, in the year 410. Here some twenty or more "Popes" are alleged to have been buried, from Ancinetus (about A.D. 151) onward—twelve or thirteen of them in the Papal crypt in the cemetery of St. Callixtus. Meantime they had become also places of concealment and of worship during the times of persecution. When at length peace was restored to the Church, and they ceased to be used for these purposes, they were visited as objects of pious interest, and places of religious festivals. Pope Damasus and others made many considerable changes and enlargements in certain portions. Damasus, especially, (about A.D. 370.) built spacious staircases, opened more *luminaria*, to supply light and air, widened galleries, expanded crypts into chapels, built substructions of masonry, and set up numerous inscriptions, always by the same artist, commemorating the triumphs of the martyr and his pious labors of restoration and decoration. Having been desecrated and plundered by the Lombards and other invaders of Rome, the principal relics are said to have been removed by the Popes in the eighth century; after which the catacombs were neglected, and, for seven or eight centuries, forgotten. At length, in May, 1578, some laborers who were digging in a vineyard on the Via Salaria, about two miles out of Rome, came unexpectedly on an old subterranean cemetery, ornamented with Christian paintings, Greek and Latin inscriptions, and two or three sculptured sarcophagi. "In that day was born the name and knowledge of *Roma sotterranea*." Among the laborious explorers of these antiquities was John Macarius, whose twenty years' explorations, though completed in 1605, were first printed in 1856. Antonio Bosio devoted thirty-six years of enormous research to the examination of the catacombs and the perusal of the Greek, Latin and Oriental fathers, and indeed of every species of writing which might illustrate their history. A part only of his results were published (A.D. 1632,) after his death. Then came a long period of indiscriminate visiting, and of destruction, systematic or spontaneous, during which many valuable relics and records perished, until at length the authorities interposed and took possession. In 1720, Father Boldetti published the results of thirty years' exploration in the tombs and crypts.

D'Agincourt spent fifty years in collecting and arranging the material for his posthumous work,—having introduced the barbarous practice of attempting to detach the pictures from the walls of the rock on which they were painted. Of many later investigations, mostly partial and imperfect, by far the most important are those of De Rossi, still in progress. It is from his published works, chiefly, that the briefer account of Drs. Northcote and Brownlow is derived.

Dr. Northcote claims for De Rossi the merit of having gained the real clue to discovery, in one respect especially—that whereas Bosio, on reaching any of the improvements made by Damasus, immediately turned away to those galleries which were in their primitive condition, De Rossi, on the contrary, made those places the chief centres of investigation, because they were certain to be connected with special tombs of the martyrs, and thus were keys to the history of the particular Catacomb. This will answer for a Romish view of the case. But a Protestant will hesitate to accept the authority, even of "Pope Damasus," for the centuries preceding his time. The same difficulty attends the other sources of information, aside from the examination of the inscriptions themselves. They are "the old Calendars and Martyrologies, the Acts of the Martyrs, the Lives of the Popes, and the Itineraries of pious pilgrims of the seventh, eighth and ninth centuries." Now it will be observed that these all come from later times through Papal hands. The itineraries of the seventh, eighth and ninth centuries may give a correct account of what the pilgrims then saw and heard, and thus furnish a correct clue to the explorations—as Dr. Northcote boasts they have done; but the seventh century is a long way from the first. Of the other documents, "the most ancient record," say our authors, "is the so called *Martyrologium Hieronymianum*; a work which, though not put together in its present form until the end of the sixth, or perhaps even the seventh century, certainly contains many portions of far older martyrologies belonging to the ages of persecution." On certain internal evidences one portion is assigned to "the earlier part of the third century, another to the beginning of the fourth, and a third to the beginning of the fifth century." But here the seventh century is the certain thing, the third the conjectural.

The Almanac of Filocalus, also quoted, is referred to the middle of the fourth century; the inscriptions of St. Damasus a little later—few of them remaining entire; the Lives of the Pontiffs are referred to the eighth, sixth, and (conjecturally) the fourth centuries, and are often in their "statements at variance with those of the Almanac, and the most ancient martyrology;" and later yet, the martyrologies of Bede and Ado, Usuard and others, acknowledged to "abound in flagrant anachronisms, legendary exaggeration and historical difficulties." As at present informed, we place little confidence in such helps manipulated by such hands. The inscriptions must be chiefly their own interpreters, under the light of archaeological science. Unfortunately, few of the inscriptions contain dates which fix the year. "There is," say our authors in a note (p. 65) "one Christian inscription

of the third year of Vespasian, *i. e.*, A.D. 72; but, unfortunately, it is no longer possible to ascertain to what cemetery it belonged,"—that is, as we understand, whether it came from the catacombs at all into the Lapidarian gallery.

One of the catacombs especially bears marks of apostolic times. It is that of St. Lucina, a large portion of which was destroyed, and the remainder choked with earth and ruins to make room for the Basilica of St. Paul. Boldetti is said to have read in this catacomb an inscription scratched in the mortar, bearing date of the consulate Sura and Senecio, or the year 107; another in marble, with the consulate of Piso and Bolano, or 110, and a third of which the name is supposed to indicate the end of the first century. Some four or five other catacombs are also referred to the same period. Various concurrent indications are thought to prove it.

As preliminary to the argument on this point, evidences are adduced to show that the earlier Christians of Rome comprised many members of the higher classes. Here are cited Paul's allusion to Caesar's household, the supposed conversion of the Consul Flavius Clemens and his wife Flavia Domitilla, (Merivale, vii. 381), the known interest of Marcia, the concubine of Commodus, in Christianity, and the testimony of Tertullian, at the beginning of the third century, that the Senate and palace were full of Christian people. The entire evidence for the apostolic date of those catacombs is thus summed up by Dr. Northcote: "Paintings in the most classical style, and scarcely inferior in execution to the best specimens of contemporary pagan art; a system of ornamentation in fine stucco, such as has not yet been found in any Christian subterranean work later than the second century; crypts of considerable dimensions, elegantly built, with cornices and pilasters of bricks or terra cotta; no narrow galleries with shelf like graves thickly placed in the walls, but spacious *ambulacra* with painted walls, and recesses provided only for the reception of sarcophagi; whole families of inscriptions, with classical names, and without any distinctly Christian forms of speech; and, lastly, actual dates of the first or second century." [But dates are scarce.] These concurrent indications are alleged by our authors to be so decisive as to have changed the prevalent opinion, and to have given to the notion of an apostolic antiquity "almost universal acceptance among those who have had an opportunity of examining the monuments themselves."

Very clearly the age of a gallery and the date of inscriptions in it are two quite different matters. The inscriptions could be made at any time after the gallery was opened, till it was finally closed. This distinction presses itself on our attention, for example, when our authors find in one cemetery (that of St. Sixtus) certain invocations of the dead in behalf of the living, which they would now refer to "the earliest ages," but which their own evidence would not carry higher than the fourth century; while some, not all, of these "invocations" are really no prayers, petitions or invocations at all, but the simple yearnings of love toward the dead. This case well illustrates the nature of the important, the vital question that over-

hangs this whole investigation, viz., the real antiquity of the inscriptions. The present volume is devoted chiefly to a presentation of the general facts connected with the history, structure and ornamentation of these interesting abodes. The particular subject of the inscriptions is reserved for another volume. It is just here, where we want light, that we shall probably feel that we are groping in darkness or in twilight. For this book, with all its show of learning and argument, reminds us at every turn, that we are in Romanist or Romanizing hands, and that the key of St. Peter's is the key of the catacombs. As a good specimen of the credulous ingenuity of the authors, we may mention an elaborate note of twelve pages, endeavoring to prove that at least the oak frame-work of the outlandish structure called St. Peter's chair, and for two hundred years, till 1867, secluded even from the eyes of the faithful, is the veritable, "material seat in which Peter himself had sat" (p. 394). What satisfactory conclusions can be hoped for from such investigators?

This work, however, is valuable for its elaborate plates, wood-cuts and diagrams; its full representations of the history and condition of the catacombs, and a large amount of scholarly research. We incline to accept its argument, that the catacombs were not originally sand-pits, and that some of them may date from apostolic times. We may also accept their statement (p 229) that the cross and monogram were not, as has been supposed, "the earliest and most common of all Christian symbols;" that there are "not found here any genuine portraits of our Blessed Lord, his holy mother, his apostles;" and that apparently "there was no consecrated model in the early ages of the Church for the figures of these sacred objects," unless this last remark should require some slight modification in the case of Peter and Paul. A fresco of Christ's baptism in the early crypt of St. Lucina, determines nothing as to mode, since the act itself is past, and John, upon the bank, holds him by the hand, while the Saviour also is stepping from the water upon the bank. John's attitude does not indicate that he himself had been in the waters; he seems to be reaching his hand to the Saviour from the opposite direction. The representation in the cemetery of San Pozziano, our authors refer—for reasons not given—to the seventh or eighth century.

On the whole, this elegant volume leaves us unsatisfied and uncertain on many essential points. We shall look with more interest than confident expectation for the volume of *Inscriptions*. In this whole subject, the date is everything.

II.—EGYPT'S RECORD OF TIME TO THE EXODUS OF ISRAEL, critically investigated: with a comparative survey of the Patriarchal History and the Chronology of Scripture; resulting in the Reconciliation of the Septuagint and Hebrew Computations, and Metho with both. By W. B. GALLOWAY, M.A., Vicar of St. Mark's, Regent's Park. Rivingtons: London, Oxford and Cambridge. 1869. Pp. 570. 8vo.

Mr. Galloway has made a laudable effort on a very important and difficult subject. He has brought to it a large amount of reading and research,

and has prepared a valuable treatise. But he shares the common fate upon this field, in being more successful in the destructive than the constructive portion of his work. It is a good service to set forth distinctly the sources of information on which Lepsius and Bunsen have built their theories of Egyptian time, and to let men see the slenderness and uncertainty of the foundations that are made to bear structures so lofty and defiant. Thus the tables of Egyptian dynasties on which they rest, came ostensibly from Manetho (a contemporary only of the Septuagint translators); but they come, in differing forms, only through George Syncellus, who lived about a thousand years later. One of the positions which Mr. Galloway argues learnedly, at length, is, that Manetho's real system included but sixteen human dynasties instead of the thirty that Lepsius and Bunsen find. A mere trifle, of course. Without entering on the merits of the question, we will say that the writer makes many good points, exposing the audacity and presumption of these "Egyptologists." But it is not easy reading.

His view of the alleged Manethonian successions of dynasties is that "they may be received as a collection of distinct and separate dynastic lists, put together by some unknown and illiterate hands, probably Jewish, having been obtained possibly, in part, from the works of Manetho, and ultimately from tablets and other documentary sources, in various cities, but unconnected with each other; the larger portion forming historically no series whatever beyond the series of Kings in each of the detached dynastic tablets. Sometimes even two lists of the same are placed one at the head of the other, and put together."

Among the author's conclusions are these: that the sojourn in Egypt was 430 and not 215 years; that the exodus took place B.C. 1541; and that the true chronology from Adam down, is given by the Septuagint and not by the Hebrew text, amounting to 5586 years before Christ. We do not propose here to discuss either of these questions. We should like a clearer showing in regard to the Septuagint. Mr. Galloway is on many points as speculative and as bold as his opponents. He boldly questions the fact of Herod's death having taken place before the present Christian era; and he reasons, in the teeth of the express usage of the Hebrew language, that the six hundred thousand *men* of Ex. xii: 37, and the same number of *males* in Numbers, i: 3, 46, were "grown-up persons" of both sexes. He would thus reduce the company that came out of Egypt to about three-quarters of a million. And what shall we say of a writer who, in the compass of eight pages (73-83), identifies the name Ukhoreus with Ekheropes, and that with Erkhophes, and hence the founder of Erich; then, finding that one Ekherops was also called Bousiris or Busiris, pronounces the latter name related to Osiris, and probably the same with "the modified form Pausiris," and equivalent, by contraction, to Baal or Bel Osir, that is, Ba'-Osir, and, in short, "of the same origin and composition with Pal-assur," meaning "Lord of Assyria," and therefore "applicable to Nimrod;" next, that Menes, also written Menas and Men, also Mines and Min, may be a mere variation for Nin or Ninus—and thus identical with Nin-merod,

(Nimrod), who again is identical thus with Busiris the Lord of Asshur and with Erechophes the founder of Erech, the founder also of Nineveh, and of another Nin-vi, Minvi or Memphis in Egypt." Here we pause for breath.

**III.—DIE LEIDEN DES MESSIAS**, in ihrer Uebereinstimmung mit der Lehre des Alten Testaments und den Aussprüchen der Rabbinen in den Talmuden, Midraschim und andern alten rabbinischen Schriften. Von DR. AUG. WUENSCHE. Leipzig. 1870. S. 122.

Dr. Wuensche thus states his theme: "The old Synagogue agrees with the Christian Church with reference to a suffering Messiah, and his expiatory offering of himself in death." "Our task is, to show that the old Synagogue has never otherwise presented or conceived the Messiah than as dying and offering himself for the sins of his people." He first traces "the idea of the "*satisfactio vicaria*" through the ceremonial institutions of the Old Testament, as pointing to "the suffering and dying Messiah," and secondly, cites the distinct prophecies of "a suffering and atoning Messiah," grouping around both classes of passages the statements of such famous men as Raschi, Aben Esra, Isaac Abarbanel, Levi ben Gerson, Moses ben Nachmann, Isaac ben Arama, Lipmann, Bechai, as to their interpretation. Then follow quotations from the Babylonian Talmud: Five passages from the book "Sanhedrin," clearly affirming in general the sorrows and sufferings of the Messiah ben Joseph; one from "Succat" affirming that "he shall be put to death," and quoting Zech. xii: 10, ("they shall look upon me whom they have pierced") in support, and a second from Succat to the same purport, identifying, however, the Messiah ben Joseph with the son of David. After these come numerous quotations from the Midrasch, or earliest Jewish commentaries, and other writings, affirming the additional fact of the atoning purpose of the Messiah's death. Thus the "Siphre deve Rab" speaks of the services of King Messiah, his "mode of death and punishment," declares that "he is humiliated on account of the rebellious"—quoting Is., liii: 5 in proof. The "Pesikta rabbati" contains the following: "Our Rabbins have delivered that the patriarchs will be raised in the month Nisan, and will say to the Messiah, 'O Ephraim, Messiah, our righteousness, though we are thy fathers, thou art far better than we, for thou hast borne our sins and the sins of our children, and over thee has passed a hard and heavy lot, such as none before or after have experienced. Thou hast been to the heathen a mockery and a derision for the sake of Israel; thou hast sat in darkness, thine eyes have not seen the light, and thy skin has not held fast upon thee. Thy body is dried up like wood; thine eyes are darkened by fasting, and thy powers are withered like a potsherd, and all for our childrens' sins.' The Messiah will answer them, 'What I have done I have done for the sake of you and your children, that thereby they may have part in the good which the Holy One—blessed be His name—has dispensed to Israel. Thereupon wilt the patriarchs reply, 'O Ephraim, Messiah, our righteousness, may thy mind be at peace since thou hast brought peace to the mind of our Lord and of us.'" (p. 68). This may serve as a specimen. The volume

closes with an appendix on "the twofold [doubled] Messiah of the Jews;" the one, Messiah ben Joseph, of the house of Ephraim or Joseph, the other Messiah ben David, of the house of David. The former lives in poverty and misery, and suffers death at last in the conflict with Gog and Magog; the other will not see death, but after the deliverance of His covenant people will reign over them eternally. It is, as the author virtually suggests, only the groping and clumsy device of substituting for the one mysterious twofold *personage* of the Christian Church and the Old Testament Scriptures *two distinct and different persons*. It appears early in the Christian era, and is found in the Talmud and the later Targums.

**IV.—LANGE'S CRITICAL, DOCTRINAL AND HOMILETICAL COMMENTARY,**  
containing Galatians, Ephesians, Philippians and Colossians. New York. 1870. Charles Scribner & Co. 8vo. Chicago: W. G. Holmes.

The first of these epistles is interpreted by Otto Schmoller, the remainder by Karl Braune, D.D. Dr. M. B. Riddle is the American editor of all but the Epistle to the Philippians, which is edited by Prof. Hackett. This volume is marked by a full harmony between the authors and the editors, and by a directness of method eminently desirable in a commentary. The authors aim to expound, and the editors refrain from long-winded side discussions. The sobriety and evangelical character of the German expositors is quite noticeable. The epistles contain many difficult passages, and fewer features of interest than some other portions of the New Testament. The commentaries address themselves to the work of endeavoring to convey the true interpretation. With the American additions, they give a pretty full account of the various interpretations, and usually express a decided preference. If we miss any thing, it is the basis of the decisions. Dr. Hackett's editing is eminently able and satisfactory. Dr. Riddle gives the literature of the interpretation, and argues more from grounds of context.

**V.—IMMORTALITY:** Four Sermons preached before the University of Cambridge, being the Hulsean Lectures for 1868. By J. STEWART PEROWNE, B.D. New York. 1870. A. D. F. Randolph & Co. Chicago: W. G. Holmes. Pp. 153. 18mo.

"I propose in this Course of Lectures," says the author, "to examine some of the grounds on which our hope of immortality rests: I propose to show that in Christ only, and the Revelation of Christ is, to be found the answer to the question of the text. [Eccles. iii: 18-22]. With this object in view, I shall first of all glance at some of the attempts which have recently been made to answer the question either in a sense adverse to Christianity or without any recognition of its claims. I shall then review the history of belief, so far as this doctrine is concerned, first among the Pagans, and next among the Jews. And lastly, I shall hope to show that whereas apart from Christianity, we are only left to dim guesses and uncertain conjectures, Christ Jesus has 'brought life and immortality to light,

and has met and satisfied the deep instincts of the human heart and the hopes of the world." (pp. 8).

The author somewhat understates the force of some of his facts. His citations from the Old Testament outrun his proposition concerning that portion of the Scriptures, and by his own admission (as in Psalms xvi and xxiii) amount to a complete confidence. "Then casting himself into the everlasting arms, he knows that these should be beneath him, though flesh and heart should fail," etc. (p. 8). This is more than "a dim guess." So, too, the intimations of a life after death in the Pentateuch are imperfectly given on p. 73. Mr. P. forgets the constant phrase, "gathered to his fathers," which even Knobel shows can not mean buried. And he overlooks the standing law against necromancy, which, if all other evidences were wanting, would be irrefutable.

**VI.—EVENINGS WITH THE SACRED POETS:** a series of quiet talks about the Singers and their Songs. By the Author of "Salad for the Solitary," etc. New York. 1870. A. D. F. Randolph & Co. Chicago; W. G. Holmes. Pp. 494. 12mo.

Evidently a labor of leisure and of love. The author, Mr. Sanders, must have been long in gathering up these gems of sacred song, and joining them together with snatches of biography and criticism. He has made free use of previous collections, and has made the most complete and satisfactory collection of the kind that we know. If his volume had been three times as large — which it ought not — we should have been glad to have it fuller in some respects: to have more of the "Biblical, Greek and early Latin," less of fragmentary selections, and in many celebrated pieces the original as well as the translation. But, within a reasonable compass, this was impracticable. We should have selected in some instances a different version. Thus, the "*Dies Iræ*," as translated by General Dix, opens in this wise:

"Day of vengeance without morrow!  
Each shall end in flame and sorrow,  
As from saint and seer we borrow."

A stanza which sadly lacks the qualities of a good *translation*. But the volume as a whole we accept as it is—a most delightful companion for an hour of quiet musing with the great, and brave and loving hearts of the whole church, in their blossom and their fragrance. It is too full to be read but in portions.

**VII.—TEXT-BOOK OF HOMEOPATHY.** By Dr. V. GRAUVOGL, of Nuremberg. Translated by Geo. E. Shipman, M.D. Chicago: C. S. Halsey and Western News Co. New York: Boerike & Tafel. 1870.

To the Homeopathist, this elaborate volume of over 400 pages, large 8vo will furnish invaluable instruction. The author, Von Grauvogl, is a celebrated Medical Director in the Prussian army, and fully competent to the work he has undertaken. The translator, himself a medical writer of high reputation, and for several years editor of a medical journal, has performed skillfully his difficult task. It is enough to say of the mechanical execution of the volume, that it is from the press of Church, Goodman & Donnelley.

VIII.—STEPPING HEAVENWARD. By E. PRENTISS, author of the "Susy Books," etc. New York: A. D. F. Randolph & Co. Chicago: W. G. Holmes. Pp. 426. 12mo. 1870.

An admirable story, well known to many, if not most of our readers. In the form of a journal commenced at the age of sixteen, it exhibits the progress and purification of an excitable, impulsive, restive, and yet high-minded girl, chafing and calming down, rebelling and repenting, desponding and recovering, under the inevitable trials and human misconstructions of married life, and mellowing at length into goodness and beauty. Almost any man, and every woman, will be benefited by the perusal.

IX.—JANET'S LOVE AND SERVICE. By MARGARET M. ROBERTSON, author of "Christie, or the Way Home," etc. New York: A. D. F. Randolph & Co. Chicago: W. G. Holmes. Pp. 581. 12mo. 1870.

Another story with a use. A Scotch minister, with his motherless family, emigrates to the United States, where the children are soon bereft of the father also. The intelligent, devoted love and noble Christian service of the widowed Janet, who left all to follow them; the rare force and character developed in the eldest daughter, Graeme, and the varying but prospered fortunes of the several children, form a pleasing group. This book also bears on the great question of woman's lot, and solves it by religion.

X.—THE CHRIST OF GOD; or, the Relation of Christ to Christianity. By Rev. ROBERT DAVIDSON, D.D. Philadelphia: Pres. Board of Publication. Chicago: W. G. Holmes. Pp. 72. 16mo. 1870.

This little volume is the substance of a discourse preached before the Synod of New York in 1867, and presents the argument for the Divinity of Christ in a clear and succinct form. Is a good book for general circulation.

XI.—DAISY'S WORK. Pp. 222. 16mo.  
ROSE'S TEMPTATION. Pp. 203. 16mo.  
PINKIE AND THE RABBITS. Pp. 212. 16mo.

New York: Robert Carter & Brothers. Chicago: W. G. Holmes.

These three charming volumes for the little ones are from the pen of Joanna H. Matthews, and are a part of a series of stories on the commandments. They happily illustrate and enforce their practical teachings to the comprehension of a child.

XII.—THE ANDES AND THE AMAZON; or, Across the Continent of South America. By JAMES ORTON, M. A., Professor of Natural History in Vassar College, etc. New York: Harper & Brothers. Chicago: S. C. Griggs & Co. 1870. Pp. 356.

This book is packed with valuable information. The scientific observations are very full. And in respect to adventures and fine descriptions, the book is eminently readable. The style is admirable. And Professor Orton is a Christian traveler. Upon the whole it is one of the best books of its kind we have recently taken up.

THE ROUND TABLE.

---

"AS DRY AS A MINISTER," is one of the latest phrases from one of the most brilliant members of the profession. It was playful, perhaps. But perhaps, also, he plays a little too much on that string. We know several young preachers that are sappy enough, though they smoke a good cigar and drive a fast horse, or at least drive a horse fast, and lose no opportunity to deride the dullness of their brethren. "It's aye an ill bird that fouls its own nest." The secular press are not slow to join the cry. A Solomon who recently signed himself "Young Yale," in *The Nation*, coolly affirms that the ministry are an inferior class of men, and therefore incompetent to manage a great college which they chiefly have made what it is. The commonest form of disparagement is to cite half-a-dozen picked lecturers, who shoot off one rocket a year across the country, against the average of ten thousand men who speak to the same audiences twice a week for years in succession; or to contrast the sifted articles of a great magazine—forming, it is said, three per cent. of those that are offered to *Harper's*—written on selected or current and exciting topics, with stated discourses on what the world would call thread-bare themes, to which the worldly man brings the interest only of aversion.

Now, to talk thus is to prate. Every profession has its peculiarities and its disadvantages. We may admit professional traits that cling more or less to the ministry: some formality, reserve, constraint, slowness, abstruseness once, some awkwardness, and occasional sanctimoniousness. But, after all these concessions, and all allowances for unworthy and unsuitable men, we submit to no such disparagement of the profession. The Protestant clergy of this country, not only in character, but in culture, taste, scholarship, social and literary influence, general intelligence, and interest as public speakers, will abide the comparison with any other considerable class of men, and abide it triumphantly.

Their relative average of success is high. When a Boston merchant once remarked to us on the small number of successful ministers, we asked him how large a proportion of the merchants around him, for forty years, had been successful. He answered, not more than 10 or 20 per cent. And we informed him that we knew no such per centage of failure in the ministry.

Most of the high literary institutions of this country, for more than two centuries, have been made, moulded and managed largely by the ministers. This, perhaps, was priestcraft. But boards of trust well know the difficulty of finding competent laymen—whether lawyers, physicians, editors or

business men—to put their shoulders to the work. This, you say, is because of the pressure of their business or the value of their time. Very well. It is the palpable measure of their interest in education, and of their *practical* fitness. Boards of trust also know the almost impossibility of getting professors from other callings than the clerical. But this, it may be said, is because men, in other callings, have discontinued scientific and literary pursuits, or are so absorbed in the profit of their professions. Make the most of that admission.

Turn the subject in any way you please, and the result is much the same. Why are college societies compelled to look for their annual orations chiefly to the ministry? The men in other employments complain, and truly too, that they can not discuss literary themes. The eminent literary men among the lawyers in this country, like Legaré and Choate, can be counted on the fingers easily; those among the doctors still easier. We have heard a few such men as Ogden Hoffman, in his prime, but they did themselves no credit. Yet there are scores, if not hundreds, of ministers in this country who can do these things well. And for a somewhat general knowledge of literary themes, we take it that no great class of men in this country can stand a moment's comparison with the clergy. Where is the country lawyer that is tinged with literature? and where the Presbyterian or Congregational clergyman that is not?

It is idle to compare the whole profession with a few lecture celebrities. Scarcely twelve lecturers are sure to pay, and foremost among these is a minister. Gough is also sure, but he succeeds dramatically, because he can tell a story the twenty thousandth time so freshly and imimitably. Some lecturers draw by their reputation chiefly, like Agassiz, Greeley, Colfax, Grant and Sherman would fill great houses. But this is not success as public speakers. Some men draw by the puffing and blowing of the press, which they can command, like a certain editor, who proved too thin for a repetition. Many of the old stock-lecturers, with their one lecture a year, are about run out. The women draw, some of them, by reason of their sex. Put a beard or a long crooked nose, like a lawyer's or a judge's, on their blessed faces; or let them stop scolding; or make the thing common; or give them, instead of their bright eyes and blooming looks, well set off by dressing, thirty years more of wisdom, with gray hair, wrinkles, spectacles, and a parchment skin, and then see. Or make them still more dazzling and bewitching in looks, and willing also to exhibit themselves to the promiscuous public for fifty cents a head, and they would draw better yet. There are plenty of old fellows, and some young ones, who would any time ride a mile and pay a dollar to look at a beautiful woman, if she spoke like a peacock.

The true test of dryness is a comparison with any other intellectual profession. Suppose the judges and the lawyers in the pulpit. How many of the judges can make a speech that would interest any audience except an impanelled jury, backed by the sheriff? How many lawyers are good, not to say interesting, advocates? How many of them can make a speech

containing any juice, except that of the Indian weed, or attracting any considerable interest, except the pecuniary. Add the voices, the gestures, the attitudes, grimaces, hesitations, and the *English* of the court-rooms, and you have the elements of a comparison. How many editors can enchain an audience not of their party? In the National Congress how many speeches are listened to?

If we speak of intellectual fertility, the minister retains and for years together holds, often with unabated freshness, the same audience of every age and class. Political speakers, with rare exceptions—like Lincoln—stump the county, state or country, with the same speech, down to the stories and the jokes. In the palmy days of Webster and Choate, when Massachusetts once was swarming with the best speaking talent of the nation, Webster's speeches in different places were the only ones reported; and for the reason, we were told, that the others would not bear reporting. When men sneer at the dryness of the ministry they would do well to see whose house contains most glass.

When we look at the literature and intellectual fertility of the country, the theme becomes too broad to prosecute. It would make a large hole in our literature to strike out such names as those of Channing, Everett, Bancroft, Sparks, King. The names of Holmes, Hildreth, the Beechers, and many more, show that there is no necessary drought in the children of an orthodox ministry. And were all the *living* men of literary culture and accomplishments among the ministry of this country to be withdrawn—names which could be reckoned by the score—we should like to see precisely from what source the breach could be filled.

INTEMPERANCE AND INTEMPERATENESS.—Which is worse, to be abusive in liquor or out of it? To talk foolishly, drunk or sober? To be intoxicated with bad spirits, or with a bad spirit? These are hard questions, and we do not care to answer them. "Be temperate in all things," says the Divine word; and that includes speech.

On the temperance question we go for total abstinence, and for what is called "a prohibitory law," whenever the moral sentiment of the community will sustain and enforce it. We think we can justify the position by sound argument, in full harmony with truth, Christian duty and legal principles. And we exceedingly recoil from all false advocacy of a good cause. We are quite sure that, when temperance reformers become intemperate in statement, disingenuous in argument, or unfair and discourteous in the treatment of those who seek the same ends, but differ only in arguments and means, it simply reacts. We formerly heard with regret some of the lecturers of the "Washingtonian" movement, who traversed New England, berating "cider-drinking deacons and wine-drinking ministers," as though these formed the warp and woof of the churches. It was, perhaps, excusable in men not yet quite clear of the odor of the ditch. One very noticeable thing in Mr. Gough, is that he never abuses other true temperance men because they do not follow him.

As to the propriety or impropriety of organizing a moral reform into a political party, we have nothing now to say. But when this takes place, is it inevitable that reformers should catch all the contagion of what one who knew called "the dirty pool of politics"—its discourtesy, its exaggeration, its unscrupulousness? Why, then, should a newspaper, edited by a Christian minister, in order to carry a laboring argument, editorially and elegantly declare that "Biblical literature is bosh," and drag forth by name another Christian minister, who has stood fire in the same general cause, to denominate his supposed views "twaddle?" And why do intelligent men seriously deal in such arguments as this: that alcohol is a vile thing, because it is the product of decomposition—when the reasoning applies *a fortiori* to vinegar? Why should they retail through the community Dr. Dufield's perversion of Eph., v.: 18? Why misrepresent testimony—palm off on the ignorant, worthless criticism for true coin, and make assertions that can not be sustained?

We ask these questions earnestly, because the cause of religion and morality is concerned. The enterprise that can not be sustained by righteous means may go down. Such a cause is not the temperance cause. There lie before us two articles, that recently appeared in two prominent religious papers, on the subjects of Communion Wine, and the Wine of Cana, which have awakened these reflections. We do not propose to answer or even to review them now. Our columns are not for controversies, nor would we willingly have a controversy any where with a true temperance man. But such methods of reasoning seem to us so hurtful that it is a duty to the Christian public to enter a protest against them. And we wish carefully to distinguish between a good clerical brother, exemplifying, we doubt not, every Christian virtue, and his argument, exhibiting almost every logical vice. Thus, why does he assert that the authorities "are well-nigh a unit" in favor of the view that the Passover law against having leaven in the house extended to all fermented liquids; when (1) not only such authorities as the Talmud and Maimonides, in ancient and mediæval times, and Schaufler, Felsenthal, and others of the same weight, in modern times, declare the contrary—but even his own great authority, Dr. Lees, admits (Temp. Bible Com., p. 28.) that "the majority of them [modern Jews] do not include under *Khamatz* [ferment] fermented wine;" and when (2) testimony concerning a fermenting liquid is utterly irrelevant concerning one that has fermented and ceased to ferment—a distinction stated to the careful and learned Dr. Eli Smith by the Jewish Rabbi *in Hebron*, while regularly using fermented wine through the Passover. Why rest the whole weight of an argument on the hazardous statement that leaven is "the symbol of corruption," and that Christ so recognized it, and consequently must have excluded fermented wine, because of the comparisons, 1 Cor., v: 6-8, and Matt., xvi: 6; when, on the other hand, the Saviour himself said: "The kingdom of heaven is like a little leaven," etc., Matt., xii: 33; Luke, xiii: 21? Why rashly seek to multiply the force of another doubtful argument by the rash statement that "three times Christ

spoke of the supper, and used the phrase, "fruit of the vine;" when, of the passages cited (Matt., xxvi: 27-29; Mark, xiv: 23-25; Luke, xxii: 19, 20), two of them manifestly, and the third possibly, record *the same utterance*? (Calvin and Meyer, *e. g.*, regard them *all* as identical; Olshausen is doubtful; Tischendorf and Robinson reckon them as two, but differ in the classification.) On what ground can any intelligent man, or dares any ignorant man, affirm that "the practice of the church from the time of Christ favors the use of unfermented wine," when all the cases that even Dr. Lees can bring together (Tem. Com., p. 282)—granting him his irrelevant and his contradicted instances—do not amount to a ripple on the surface. What does an honest man mean at this day by quoting MacKnight to the effect that the word "drunken" (*μεθύει*) means, "is plentifully fed"!

Why should a writer open his article on the wine of Cana by endeavoring to classify those total abstinence men who do not accept his arguments with the former defenders of slavery? Why should he bear the unqualified, and therefore false witness, that the Biblical scholarship of Andover, Princeton and New Haven, "once supported American slavery," and close his article by representing those who differ from him as "anxious to make the Bible favor wine-drinking"? And whereas the question of Bible wines is one of *fact*, therefore of evidence, and therefore of true scholarship, why deride scholarship and learning to appeal to the "common people" on such a theme? Dangerous and unwise at best, it is especially hazardous in men of no scholarship. And how could a truth-loving man, in order to lay a foundation for his views concerning the wine of Cana, make and repeat the astounding statement that, "What the Five Points are to New York city, that was Galilee to Palestine"? A statement of which it is not easy whether most to admire its *utter* historic baselessness, or its wholesale slander of an entire Jewish province, to which the Saviour sometimes retired from the machinations of Jerusalem. Why rest the whole weight of his argument, in various versions, concerning the wine of Cana, on a foundation which we rebuke and repudiate when it is made the basis of Universalism, namely, that Christ's character settles the whole question of fact? Why be guilty of the fallacy that "good wine," in the language of Jewish festivities—and that in the "Five Points" of Palestine—meant the same as in the mouth of a Massachusetts reformer? Why quote the carpings of wicked men about communion wine as though they were entitled to special respect? Why blindly and weakly declare that "nothing of importance can be said in favor of total abstinence if Christ favored wine drinking at Cana"—under vastly different circumstances from ours?

Such utterances—and we could easily enlarge the list—are sad exhibitions in a great moral enterprise. Good men are bound to disclaim and calmly to resist and rebuke them. The cause of temperance, of total abstinence from intoxicating drinks as a beverage, in these modern times and circumstances, is a noble Christian enterprise. Let it not be degraded by the arts of the demagogue.

**FOREIGN MISSIONS.**—A new responsibility is upon us. Our churches are now to carry the American Board. A glorious freight, if only our shoulders are broad enough, or rather if our heart is large enough. Our Presbyterian friends, as a body, have withdrawn, most of them reluctantly. Hitherto they have contributed about \$100,000 of the annual income. They probably assume missions of which the annual cost is \$50,000 or \$60,000. There is also left a small debt of \$23,000. Are we ready? There would not be the slightest difficulty if the mass of our churches came up to the standard of a part of them. In truth, the tobacco-money of our church-members, we grieve to say, would undoubtedly run the whole machinery.

The Sandwich Islanders put us to the blush. Last year they raised \$30,000 for Foreign Missions. In comparison, what is \$500,000, or a million, to the Congregational churches of this country? True, they gave a larger proportion of their contributions than we to Foreign Missions—22 per cent. of their money and 30 per cent. of their ministry; whereas the churches of this country gave but five per cent. of their money and *one per cent.* of their ministers. One religious editor denominates such a comparison "an exaggerated estimate" of the foreign work. But we believe the Sandwich Islander is nearer the gospel standard than the New York editor To retain 99 per cent. of the ministry, and 95 per cent. of the funds among forty millions, and give but one per cent. of our ministry to six or eight hundred millions of false-religionists, looks like a form of Christian selfishness.

Do not plead home work in excuse. The best missionary givers are usually the best home givers and workers. "Go ye into all the world." When the collection for Foreign Missions comes round, in our judgment it should be the largest. And for a good reason. We are giving all the rest of the year for the home work in various forms. But the *one* collection for Foreign Missions includes all these various forms of benefaction together for the foreign field. It builds school-houses, pays teachers, supports scholars (in part), erects church edifices, pays the minister, prints newspapers and books, and circulates tracts and Bibles. Stop it for a year, and you pull up an oak tree to set it out again.

The American Board is in its history, character, work and membership, living and dead, one of the most remarkable bodies the world has seen. Let us be thankful for the legacy, and nobly meet our responsibility.

**RELIGIOUS EXPERIENCES.**—In a recent editorial (Oct. 8th), the *Christian Union* protests against the practice of calling upon the candidate at a Congregational installation to relate "his religious experience," and declares that "the whole inquiry [should] be omitted by Councils." It shall speak for itself;

"He has been long a member of a Christian church; has been three years in a theological seminary, and is furnished with a certificate of qualifications from its guardians; and now, on the very day of his formal instatement over his charge, he is called on by a council of ministers to

"relate his religious experience," as if that was the time and the way for him to establish his Christian character!

The practice has a graver objection against it than that of uselessness. The processes through which the soul has found its God and lived in communion with him are by right among its sacred secrets. Some men can easily and freely speak of such things, and when done voluntarily this is perfectly right, and may edify others. But there are multitudes to whom it is profanity to thus lay bare their deepest experiences, and the custom which obliges a man to do this, often before a large audience, is simplyquisitorial. One of its worst features is, that when the candidate has replied to the general question with whatever he chooses to say, he must then stand open to a fire of special inquiries. Was he educated by pious parents? Can he fix the exact date at which he began a new life? What special circumstances led to the change? And so on. By what right do his examiners thus require him to lay bare his heart before a hundred people?

We have often wished to see the man whose rights are thus invaded defend himself as well as make a protest," etc.

The above utterance betrays a raw hand. It is journeyman's work. In the first place, "the fire of special inquiries," to the extent implied, is not common, except where there are special circumstances of interest to draw them out. We never yet heard them pressed in any offensive or annoying mode; but we have often seen the interest of the whole examination culminate in the "experience." We well remember the unmingleld delight with which a large audience once listened to the experiences of five young missionaries in succession. It was a wonderful exhibition of diversities of method, but the same Spirit and the same goal. At the last ordination we attended, the candidate's experience was one of great interest. It is so, often, in the admission of members to the church. 2. Theological seminaries *do not* "furnish a certificate of qualifications," *in this respect*. We are amazed that a religious editor should make that mistake. It is a certificate primarily of intellectual training and acquisitions. The faculty are not empowered to act as a church does in receiving members. Andover, we believe, is still restrained from rejecting applicants at pleasure. And while the faculties of the seminaries endeavor to exclude or to remove those whose moral or Christian character is evidently unfit, let the churches understand that seminaries do not, and can not, usurp the place of the churches. 3. It would be utterly uncongregational for a *Congregational* church to turn this matter over to a theological seminary. A religious editor should know that, too. 4. Church membership of long standing is no reason for dispensing with that examination. The young brother is assuming a position of new and high responsibility. Great interests are to be carefully guarded. The inquiry is reasonable and indispensable. He comes, also, into intimate relations to a new body of men. They have a right to know for themselves what he is. 5. A right-minded candidate will never feel that "his rights are thus invaded." He will be ready to give a reason for the hope that is in him, even to the showing of how the Lord has led him. A man who can not thus "lay bare his deepest experiences" to his friends and brethren and his flock, in entering on the most solemn and intimate relation, is too reserved and too thin-skinned for the ministry.

He never will lay open his heart in a sermon. He will always stay shut up from his flock.

The truth is, religion is not a secret; nor are even the ways in which Christ has led us to himself to be "sacred secrets," when we are called to a public relation in which everything depends on the validity of those very processes. We had supposed that this species of sentimentalism was confined to those denominations that waive the whole question of heart piety. We knew a case, not long since, where the candidate's friends felt indignant that he was closely though courteously examined on his doctrinal belief. If, now, we are to surrender also the knowledge of his religious experience, we are nearing a new order of things. And if, to this letting-up or letting-down upon the ministry, we add the omission of critical inquiry into "the precise character of the experience" of candidates for church membership — after the manner of some—the Congregational churches have before them a destiny not difficult to predict. What next?

**RELIGIOUS REPUBLICS.\***—This fair volume illustrates a number of things. Its title illustrates the fact that English Congregationalism is republicanism in the face of monarchy. Two of the Essays—those on "The Spirit of Nonconformity" and "The External Relations of Congregationalism"—illustrate the fact that our ancestral faith, in the mother country, lives under the shadow of a secular and political "church." The word Nonconformity has no meaning this side the Atlantic. The authorship of another article illustrates the fact that English Baptists are avowedly but a species under the genus Congregationalists. The subject of that article, viz., "Congregationalism and Aesthetics," exemplifies the exclusive association of tastefulness in religion, to *English* minds, with the Established Church. And the subject of another, "Congregationalism and Science," carries the implication that the State religion in England is not in accord with science, while Dissent makes no quarrel with it.

Four of the writers of these Essays are laymen, and but one of the other ten is pastor of a Congregational church. None of them are men of mark, or representative men. Three are barristers at law. One of their aims is "to describe the religious system of Congregationalists, whether Baptist or Independent." They suppose their views to be those of "the younger generation of English Congregationalists." We are all interested in knowing what our brethren over sea are and think; and perhaps no essay in the book will be read generally with more interest than the third, despite its lumbering title, viz., "The Congregationalist Character."

The writer distinguishes Congregationalists from Churchmen on the one hand, and from Wesleyans on the other, and then describes the Congregationalists of the past generation, and shows how those of the present day both resemble and differ from them. "Congregationalists now demand a freer speculation in all matters connected with theology (so far as is con-

\* **RELIGIOUS REPUBLICS:** Six Essays on Congregationalism. London : Longmans, Green & Co. Pp. 275.

sistent with a firm hold of the most important articles of faith), and a more extended sympathy with various modes of thought and of feeling not connected with religion." Religious experience is more valued for itself, less as evidence of one's good estate. Many subordinate matters of belief are held in suspense. The creed is less complete. The Old Testament has less authority. The Sabbath is kept more for its benefits than because of its sacredness. Kneeling in prayer is less common; standing to pray is universal. The music used is more varied. A new feeling for art is manifest, but it is not ritualistic. With the decline of the feeling of constant Divine guidance a freer indulgence in amusements once forbidden has come in. Where old habits and views are clung to, the Lord's Supper is more completely old-fashioned than anything beside—a monthly ordinance, and it is every member's duty to attend. Generally a minister presides, but a layman may, if necessary. A collection is always taken for the poor of the church. Preaching is not so instructive and doctrinal as it once was. It is "more varied and interesting, though often less profound and less useful." "Religious thought has lost some of the intensity of concentration."

On the other hand, the old feeling, the Puritan feeling, of individual responsibility for belief remains. The "brotherhood" will not leave all to the minister. The Sunday-school is carried on without tasking him to aid. New churches are started by laymen. The deacons are less relaxed in their idea of a Christian life than the church members, and they less than the congregation. The minister generally is not overstocked with education, marries early, learns how to deal practically with men and affairs, cares more for moral qualities than mere address in his associates, preaches with independence, honesty and fidelity; is rarely sent away by action of the church; is allowed large liberty of profession, and is not usually afraid to avow any change of views. His agreement with those whom he teaches, in respect to doctrinal views, is not of constraint or obligation, but from conviction. "It has been well said that while Churchmen subscribe creeds without believing them, Congregationalists believe them without subscribing."

As to general English peculiarities we gather from the other essays that pew-leasing is not so general as it was. More or less slip room is regularly given to occasional worshipers and strangers. In the admission of church members the adoption of the Congregational polity seems to be more commonly required than in this country. The examination by "deputies" of candidates is hardly more than a form. Matters of routine in administration are carried on by the pastor and deacons, the church being appealed to only in cases of special importance. Evangelical opinions are almost universally held. The young vote in church meetings as well as the aged—women as well as men. Church fellowship is not as general as it should be—too often is practically only fellowship with the pastor. Too often membership is not associated with any specific Christian work.

Much that is said in these Essays agrees with the testimony of the English correspondent of the *Congregationalist* (T. C. Turberville, Esq., Ed.

*Eng. Independent,) that, "in England, there has been so little doctrinal preaching, or theological teaching, for the last forty years, that the congregations have very little idea of the completeness and strength of the Calvinistic argument, and are quite ready to follow their ministers into broader plains, and sometimes to lose themselves in the mists of a vague sentimentalism." Mr. Turberville, however, gives the testimony of the Scotch brethren, that among them Calvinism is not at all "dying out." Rev. Thomas Binney, of London, makes the following statement, in his "Weigh House" sermons, touching one point of English Calvinism — the views held of Atonement: "Forms of thought, indeed, and modes of expression respecting the work of Christ, once regarded as sacred and binding, have very much ceased to be heard, or are heard in the distance as they are passing away—heard as sounds comparatively faint and few. Even modern explanations, confining everything to the subjective in Christ, are to some as unsatisfactory as the old gross mercantile theory. The latter they respect, because it can be understood; its sharp points are distinctly enough perceived, and, in proportion to their distinctness, are felt to expel from the Gospel every thing like grace or favor, making it to consist only of the stern and unabated exactions of justice, and that, too, twice over. The former they do not so clearly apprehend; explanations are heard which seem to need to be explained — a theory advanced requiring to be divested of mist and metaphysics, if it is to stand out in clear and tangible outline; and so they can not grasp it. But, not liking to condemn what is not understood, they may be said, perhaps, neither to accept nor deny." Mr. Binney's own view of Christ's work as a redemptive propitiation, taking away sin through his blood, he thus states (p. 296): "Christ died to destroy our sins, to put them away, to deliver us from them; that is, to secure them forgiveness; to annihilate, as it were, both them and their results. The forgiveness of sin is not simply a matter of *kind feeling* on the part of God, flowing forth on a *change* of feeling in man; but it required that something should be *done* to put away sin, and that something *was* done when the Christ died on account of it." "Love, compassion, mercy (on God's part, but) the forgiveness of sin depended on *something else* — that being an *external fact* — a thing done—done by Christ."*

We put together, in this connection, several statements by the essayists on "Religious Republics." "The theological views prevalent among Congregational churches are held by them in common with many other evangelical bodies; their distinctive characteristics are the requiring of spirituality of character in the members, and the adoption of a particular form of church government." "The religious teachers most in favor are not the dispensers of honeyed words and soothing remarks on the general excellence of mankind and the particular virtues of the congregations before them, but the stern upholders of the dogma of the natural depravity of the human race, the preachers of self-distrust, and the unflinching denouncers of evil." On the other hand, "no assent to any formal creed is required from the member on his admission;" "instances of the infliction

of any penalty for heretical opinions are extremely rare;" and "there is a perceptible tendency to relax the ancient regulations, and to smoothen the road from the congregation to the church." "Religious thought has lost some of the intensity of concentration, and there are times when the older people sigh for a more constant presentation of those 'grand truths' which were the food of their early piety." Still, "the doctrine of redemption by the atonement of Christ holds a prominent place in the sermons of the most influential preachers."

We are interested in the ground these essays take on external matters—architecture, for instance. Congregationalists "have been so enamored of the national style that they have sown the land over with *miserable imitations of Gothic churches* ('hear! hear!') But as our principles are understood and acted out, this abuse will cease. We want neither chancel nor transept, for we have no altars; we want no high-pitched roofs, for we have no incense to wreath up its curling smoke, and no supliced choristers to pour forth chant and response. Unlike the old monks, we have no religious sympathies to embody in our architecture. They did the very best that they could for their ritual." "We reckon it to be right to appeal through the ear to the reason, the intellect and the heart. A blind man can follow and thoroughly relish our service." "A refined and well-educated Congregationalist must reject Gothic, just because if it pleases his eye it will violate his convictions; or if, on the other hand, it satisfies his principles and demands, it must outrage his sense of beauty and harmony."

In respect to the amusement discussion, it is stated that "the natural working of our principles is in the direction of an increased earnestness and seriousness, which will make much that is not to be condemned to be at the same time avoided as inconvenient." "A very slight amount of good taste, and the fearlessness to assert and exercise it, would lead most men instinctively to shun the imbecile recreations for which certain persons, accidentally endowed with high rank, but to whom the law of compensation has refused any natural refinement, have set the fashion." But, in near connection with this, the assertion is hazarded, "only the fear of excess can account for avoiding the luxury of whist and billiards." To an American Christian, there is reason enough in "luxury" itself for avoiding it, as an excess *per se*.

Some statements on other topics are so well made that we should be tempted to append a few of them if we had room.

THE ALUMNI INSTITUTE of Chicago Theological Seminary has just closed the fourth of its interesting and profitable sessions. Among its exercises were, a sermon, with criticisms; an experience meeting; a Greek Testament exegesis; a review and discussion of Beecher's sermons; debates on church and Sabbath-school music; on the devotional use of Bible in public schools, and on the method of reaching the masses; expositions of two Psalms; lectures on the social power of the church, and on John Calvin; elocutionary exercises in reading the Scriptures; readings from Shakespeare's Julius Cæsar, with essay and criticisms.

WOMAN'S BOARDS OF MISSIONS are doing valiant service. The two Boards which have their headquarters at Boston and at Chicago, have raised, during the past year, more than \$20,000. And, what is better yet, they have awakened and diffused a deepening interest in the cause of missions. Working through organizations already in existence, their operations are singularly inexpensive and telling. They carry the mission work into the home on both sides of the ocean — a double-edged stroke. It is one of the happiest and most hopeful enterprises of the day. We believe it is destined to do more than any one form of agency, in the newer States, for the cause of Foreign Missions. It reaches the springs of feeling and of action. We observe that *Christian* women somehow succeed in finding their hands full of Christian work.

An informal meeting of both Boards at Brooklyn, in connection with the American Board, was one of great interest. The annual meeting of the Woman's Board of Missions for the Interior is to take place at Detroit on the 3d of November. We wish them a goodly gathering.

NATIONAL CONFERENCE OF CHURCHES.—*Editors:* The author of the article "A National Conference of Congregational Churches," REVIEW, September, 1870, mistakes (from lack of an official copy) the action of the Massachusetts General Association as to proposed basis. That Association recommended "That every local Conference shall send one representative, minister or layman; and that every Conference containing twenty-five churches or more shall send two representatives." The author of the article quotes some report, which I have not seen, which omitted the words I have italicised, and argues very justly, but he will now see needlessly, against the apparent preponderance of ministers. I have reason to know that the intent of the framers was to call special attention to the propriety of sending a layman where but one delegate could be sent. The Massachusetts Association itself, when full, has fifty-four (54) ministerial delegates and seventy two (72) lay delegates.

Agreeing heartily with the spirit and arguments of the article, I am unwilling that the mistake should remain uncorrected.

Truly yours, A. H. QUINT,  
Secretary of Massachusetts General Association.  
NEW BEDFORD, Mass., Sept. 14, 1870.

EVANGELISTS.—Diverse views have prevailed on the subject of employing the labors of evangelists. We present an able article on one side of the question. Probably the other side will soon be presented in our pages—not, however, in any controversial form.

vo  
ve  
et,  
is-  
ra-  
rk  
is  
eve  
es,  
of  
ng

the  
the  
on

the  
ew,  
the  
ion  
ive,  
five  
the  
ords  
sly,  
ow  
ety  
ssa-  
ele-

am

n.

loy-  
le of  
ages